DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 837 SP 013 204

AUTHOR	Leyser, Yona
TITLE	The Effects of Role Playing in Elementary School Classrooms on Children with Low Sociometric Status. Final Report 50.3.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 76
GRANT	OEG 9-242178-4149-032
NOTE	257p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, Indiana University, Smith Research Center, Room 1500, Bloomington, Indiana 47401 ($4.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$14.05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Patterns; Elementary Education; Group Dynamics; *Group Status; *Peer Acceptance; *Role Playing; *Self Concept; *Social Behavior; Social Stratification; *Sociometric Techniques; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to design an intervention strategy, including role-playing techniques and activities, and to train teachers in their use in the classroom in order to improve the social status of socially rejected children. Other objectives were to change teachers' and peers' perceptions of the rejected children as well as to change the self-perceptions of the rejected children themselves. This investigation developed role-playing materials and trained teachers in their use in the classroom to help students develop skills in coping with situations and behaviors previously identified as leading to rejection. Three major conclusions were reached in this study. Role-Playing intervention used in the classroom over a short period of time with the purpose of changing the social status of rejected children has a very limited effect on their acceptance or rejection by peers. Also, this type of intervention has little effect on the teacher's perception of the student, while it may have some effect on the self-perceptions of unpopular children. Appended to this report are samples of instruments and tests, and testing and scoring instructions for teachers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161837

THE EFFECTS OF ROLE-PLAYING IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSROOMS ON CHILDREN WITH LOW SOCIOMETRIC STATUS[1]

Yona Leyser

February, 1976

Final Report 50.3

Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped

Indiana University

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

[1]This research was supported by grant #OEG 9-242178-4149-032 from the U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to the Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

SP013204

The Effects of Role-Playing in Elementary School Classrooms on Children With Low Sociometric Status

Yona Leyser

Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped

Indiana University

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to design a role-playing intervention which would (1) improve the social status of rejected pupils, (2) change teachers' and peers' perceptions of these pupils, (3) change the self perception of the rejected pupils themselves, and (4) increase the performance of the rejected pupils on a social problem-solving test.

It was hypothesized that the implementation of the role playing program in the classroom would be effective in achieving each of the above objectives.

Sixty-five third through fifth grade classrooms in two school districts in southern Indiana participated in the study. The investigation was conducted in two stages. In the first stage a teacher training manual in role playing and related materials was developed and piloted in several classrooms. In the second stage teachers in the experimental group were trained in the use of role-playing, and then implemented the program in their classrooms, twice a week over a ten week period.

Instruments used for testing the children included a sociometric test, the Reputation Test, a social problem-solving test, and a teacher rating scale.

The major hypotheses were tested utilizing analysis of covariance. No statistically significant differences on adjusted post-test means on the total sample were found between the experimental and the control groups on the acceptance score, the rejection score, the net summation score, teacher

rating, or on the reputation test (peer ratings and self ratings). No differences between the groups appeared on the problem solving test. However certain trends were observed when the data were examined separately for the two school districts.

Other findings of the study indicated that (1) teachers implemented the program as outlined to them, and were open in trying a number of different activities and techniques, (2) teachers were very positive in their evaluations of the total program. However, they had some reservations about the magnitude of the social gains for their pupils, (3) teachers rated significantly different the socially rejected, the average, and the highly chosen students on the rating scale, (4) rejected pupils were described by peers as "not friendly," "not a leader," "not popular," "not tidy," "unfair in games," and "quarrelsome," (5) a post hoc analysis revealed a relatively large difference between treatment groups favoring experimental classrooms in the percent of "stars."

The very limited effects of the program were discussed in light of the short duration of the intervention, and its late implementation in the school year. It was also speculated that because teachers were not informed which students were selected as the focus of the intervention these students might have been called on less often by the teachers to actively participate in the role playing as would have been desired.

The different trends noticed between the two school districts were discussed in light of their different educational philosophy, their different experiences with affective education, and the impact of a "John Henry Effect," namely the motivation of one districts' control group to out do the innovative experimental treatment group.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		v
LIST OF TABLES		xii
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background to the Problem	1
	Purpose	3
II	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
	Determinants of Social Status	6
	Behavioral Correlates of Acceptance and Rejection	7
	Attempts to Modify the Status of the Low Status Child	11
	Roleplaying as an Intervention Technique	20
	Hypotheses	25
III	PROCEDURES	28
	Overview	28
	The Sample	28
	Experimental Procedures	30
	The Development of the Instructional Materials	31
	Preliminary Field-Test Formative Evaluation	35
	The Intervention Program (Main Field Test)	36
	Data Collection Instruments	38
	A Sociometric Measure	38
	Test Analysis	39
	The Reliability and Validity of the Sociometric Test	40
	"Who Are They?"Test or the Reputation Test	42
	Test Analysis	43
	Reliability	43
	Validity	44
	Teacher Rating Scale (The Social Behaviors Rating Scale)	45
	"What Would You Do?" (A Social Problem Solving Test)	45
	Administration in the Study	46
	Scoring Procedures	46
	Lesson Activities and Evaluation Sheet	47
	Design and Statistical Analyses	48
	Design	48
	Analyses of the Data	49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

CHAPTER		Page
IV	RESULTS	50
	Implementation of the Program in the Classroom	50
	Number of Role Playing Sessions	50
	How Much did Teachers Follow the Sequence of Role Playing Steps?	52
	Experimentation with Alternatives	55
	Conclusions	58
	Teacher Evaluation of the Project	59
	Teacher Evaluation of the Program's Usefulness for Themselves	59
	Evaluation of the Manual and the Materials	63
	Impact of the Program on Students	64
	Statistical Analyses of the Data Obtained from the Measurements of the Impact on the Children	66
	Change in Social Status of the Unpopular Children	66
	Choice Status (Acceptance Scores)	67
	Rejection Status Index	69
	Net Score Index	69
	Teacher Ratings	69
	Teacher Ratings of the Unpopular Children Before and After Treatment	73
	Results from the Reputation Test	76
	The Peer Nomination Scale	76
	The Self-Nomination Scale	79
	Results from the Social Problem Solving Test	84
	Problem Solving in the Experimental and Control Groups	86
	Changes in Distribution of the Sociometric Choices-A Post Hoc Analysis	88
V	DISCUSSION	92
	The Implementation of the Role Playing Program	92
	The Impact of the Program on the Social Status of the Rejected Children	95
	The Impact of the Program on Teacher Perceptions	106
	The Impact of the Program on Peer and Self Perceptions on the Reputation Test	110
	The Impact of the Program on the Performance on the Social Problem-Solving Test	112

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

CHAPTER		Page
	The Changes in the Distribution of the Sociometric Choices--A Discussion of the Post Hoc Analysis	114
	Some Final Remarks Concerning the Programs Impact	118
VI	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	120
	Summary	120
	Purpose of Study	120
	Hypotheses	121
	Sample	121
	Experimental Procedures	122
	Results	122
	Other Findings	123
	Conclusions	126
	Limitations of Study	126
	Implications and Suggestions for Future Research	128
BIBLIOGRAPHY		130

APPENDICES

A	(a) Teacher Implementation of the Role-Playing Program (b) Teachers Evaluation of the Program	141
B	Nonparametric Tests on Acceptance Score, Rejection Score, Net Score, Total Peer-Nomination Score and Total Self-Nomination Score for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	146
C	Stability of Rejection Score in District A and District B	152
D	Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables on the Reputation Test and Self-Nomination Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	154
E	Analyses of Variance Tables on Teacher Ratings (for Combined Districts) and Problem Solving Test for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	161
F	Instruments and Tests	168

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

APPENDICES		Page
G	Stories Adapted and Their Major Themes.	190
H	Teacher Training Manual	194
I	General Testing Instructions for the Teachers	225
J	Scoring Instructions for the Social Problem Solving Test. . .	229
K	Letter of Permission.	237
L	Workshop Outline.	240
M	Time Table for Testing and Instruments.	242

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Summary of Variables Associated with Sociometric Status	12
2	Frequency Distribution of Role-Playing Sessions in Two School Districts	51
3	Mean Percent of Teachers and Mean Percent of Sessions in Which the Role-Playing Steps and Techniques were Implemented. (Data for Combined Districts)	53
4	Teacher Evaluation of the Program	60
5	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Acceptance Scores for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	68
6	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Rejection Scores for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	70
7	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	71
8	Teacher Ratings (Means) of the Most "Rejected," the "Average," and the "Stars" on the Positive and Negative Scales (Combined Experimental and Control Groups)	73
9	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on the Total Positive Score on Teacher Rating Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	74
10	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on the Total Negative Score on Teacher Rating Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	75
11	Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for 13 Variables of Peer Nomination Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	78
12	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Total Score of Peer Nomination Scale, for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	80
13	Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for 13 Variables of Self-Nomination Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	82

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

Table		Page
14	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Total Score on Self-Nomination Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	83
15	Average Agreement and Correlation Co-Efficients Between the Two Judges on Fluency, Flexibility and Quality	84
16	Intercorrelations Between Fluency, Flexibility, and Quality	86
17	Group Means and Analysis of Variance Results on Fluency, Flexibility, and Quality Criteria on Problem Solving Test for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	87
18	Means on Problem-Solving Test for Unpopular, Average, and Most Popular Children (for Both Districts Combined and for Experimental and Control groups Combined)	88
19	Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on the Percent of all Pupils in the Highly Accepted Category for District A, District B, and Combined Districts	90
20	Stability (Percent) of Pupils in the Low Status Group who Remained in the Same Sociometric Category on the Posttest (on Net Score)	102
21	Mean Percent of Teachers, and Mean Percent of Sessions in Which the Role-Playing Steps and Techniques were Implemented in District A, District B, and Combined Districts	142
22	Teacher Evaluation of the Program in District A, District B, and Combined Districts	144
23	Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms which Gained or Did Not Gain in Acceptance from Pre- to Posttesting	147
24	Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms which Showed a Small or a Large Decrease in Rejection from Pre- to Posttesting	148
25	Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms which Showed a Small or a Large Decrease on Net Score from Pre- to Posttesting	149
26	Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms which Decreased or Increased on Total Score on Reputation Test from Pre- to Posttesting	150

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

Table		Page
27	Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms which Increased or Did Not Increase on Total Score on Self-Nomination Scale from Pre- to Posttesting	151
28	Stability of Rejection Score	153
29	Univariate Analyses of Covariance for Three Clusters of Variables on Reputation Test (Peer Nominations) for District A	155
30	Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables on Reputation Test (Peer Nominations) for District B	156
31	Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables on Reputation Test (Peer Nominations) for Combined Districts	157
32	Univariate Analyses of Covariance for Three Clusters of Variables on Self-Nominations Scale for District A	158
33	Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables on Self-Nominations Scale for District B	159
34	Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables on Self-Nominations Scale for Combined Districts	160
35	Analyses of Variance on Teacher Rating Scale for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students for Total Positive and Total Negative Scores (Combined Districts)	162
36	Teacher Ratings (Mean Scores) of "Average" Students, and of "Stars," in the Experimental Group (N=26) and Control Group (N=26) on pre- and posttests	163
37	Analyses of Variance on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students on Three Criteria for District A	164
38	Analyses of Variance on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students on Three Criteria for District B	165
39	Analyses of Variance on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students on Three Criteria for Combined Districts	166
40	Mean Scores on Three Criteria on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Children in District A, District B, and Combined Districts	167

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

Table		Page
41	Stories Adapted, and Type of Behavior or Characteristic Addressed	191
42	Time Table for Testing and Instruments	243

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

The relatively rich literature dealing with the social acceptance of the mildly handicapped child in the regular and special classroom has direct bearing on an intervention program aimed at changing the social status of the low status child in the elementary school classroom. Several investigations have demonstrated that the mildly handicapped child is less accepted than his normal peers in regular classrooms (Baldwin, 1958; Johnson, 1950; Johnson & Kirk, 1950). Johnson (1961) found that the mentally handicapped are more accepted by their peers in special classrooms than in regular classrooms.

Findings from research on educable mentally retarded (EMR) children who are partially integrated into the regular classroom are in line with those reported above. For example, Lapp (1957) found that partially integrated EMR children in grades three through six had significantly lower acceptance scores than their normal peers, although EMR children were not found to have higher rejection scores. Rucker, Howe, and Snider (1969) found that EMR children who participated part time in a regular junior high school program had significantly lower social position scores than did their non-retarded peers, regardless of whether they participated in an academic program (science) or a nonacademic program (physical education). Once again, the EMR children were shown to be more accepted by their peers in the special classrooms.

Recent research findings on EMR children fully integrated into the regular classroom seem to agree with earlier findings. Gottlieb and Budoff (1972) reported that EMR children who were integrated into open concept schools were more often known to their normal peers but were not liked better than EMR children in a walled school. Goodman, Gottlieb, and Harrison (1972) reported on an experimental integration of EMR children into a non-graded elementary school. They found that EMR children who were completely integrated were significantly more rejected and less often accepted than the average IQ children. Furthermore, the integrated EMR children were rejected significantly more often than the segregated EMR children. However, these findings held only for boys. Intermediate subjects (grades 4-6) were more rejecting than younger subjects (in grades 1-3). In another study, Gottlieb, Cohen, and Goldstein (1973) found that attitudes of "regular" children toward EMR children were most favorable in schools without retarded children and that attitudes were less favorable when regular children had opportunities for social contact with the EMR children.

The length of contact or length of integration does not seem to have a positive effect on the acceptance of the EMR child by his "normal" peers. Monroe and Howe (1971) reported that the length of integration of EMR children into regular junior high classes not only failed to show any positive effect but also indicated that the third-year group tended to score lower on a sociometric test than did the second and first-year groups of adolescents.

Additional evidence has been reported supporting the conclusion that mildly retarded children are less accepted than their nonretarded peers in the regular classrooms. Several writings have noted a positive correlation between intelligence and social status (Bonney, 1943; Bonney & Powell, 1953; Cunningham and associates, 1951; Laughlin, 1954; Sears, 1963). Dentler and Mackler (1962) reviewed several research studies and concluded that a moderate (.30 - .50) correlation had been found between intelligence and peer acceptance in regular classrooms, in special classrooms, and in institutions. Positive correlations between IQ and sociometric status were also reported in a review by Hartup (1970).

Whereas more and more school systems are attempting to "mainstream" mildly handicapped children back into the regular classroom, it is imperative to point out that the literature strongly suggests that such children are likely to be rejected and isolated by their "normal" classmates. Therefore, intervention programs designed to help mildly handicapped children cope with the social problems they are likely to face in the regular classroom are urgently needed.

Purpose

The overall purpose of this study was to design an intervention strategy to improve the social status of unpopular (socially rejected) children in their classrooms. The intervention was based on a series of classroom activities in which role-playing methods and procedures were utilized by trained regular classroom teachers. The objective of the program was to teach students social interaction skills. Social interaction skills were defined as those skills which include: (a) the

ability to understand the other person's perspective, or the ability to "feel with" or be sensitive to the feelings, needs, and behaviors of the other person; (b) the ability to accept the person who differs; and (c) the ability to act in a more effective and communicative manner while interacting with peers.

This program is, therefore, not only directed toward the low status child, but also to his/her classmates. The assumption behind this type of strategy is that, in order to change the social position of the low status child, changes in his behaviors toward peers, or changes in the way he communicates with them, should be concomitant with changes in the behaviors of his peers toward him. In other words, the sensitivity, understanding, and reactions of peers toward the rejected or isolated child are perceived as very crucial in the matrix of relationships between low status children and peers.

More specific purposes of the study were:

(1) To develop a structured and sequential roleplay curriculum unit to be implemented by teachers in their classrooms. This curriculum, presented in the form of a teacher manual, included directions and guidance, as well as a review of several role-playing techniques and strategies. Also included were a series of short and long unfinished stories dealing with behaviors or characteristics identified in the literature as correlates of peer acceptance and rejection.

(2) To train regular classroom teachers in the use of role-playing techniques and activities in their classrooms. The training was

provided during workshops at the beginning of the program and as individual weekly consultation experiences during the implementation of the program itself.

(3) To measure whether the intervention program in which role-playing activities and methods had been implemented by teachers in their classes was effective.

Criteria for effectiveness were: (1) improvement in the social status of pupils who were identified as socially rejected[1] in their classes at the beginning of the program; (2) changes in teachers' perceptions of rejected students following the program; (3) changes in peer perception of the rejected students following the program; (4) changes in self-perceptions of rejected students following the program; and (5) improvement in the ability to solve human relations problems.

---

[1]The terms "target population," "rejected," "low status," and "unpopular students" will be used interchangeably in this investigation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Determinants of Social Status

Numerous studies conducted over the years concerning the correlates of sociometric status demonstrate a variety of personal and social characteristics associated with popularity. Such personal factors as intelligence, scholastic achievement, age, skills, interests, values, and physical appearance, and such social factors as community social structure, child rearing, and residential proximity have been shown to be related to sociometric status (see reviews by Gronlund, 1959; and Hartup, 1970). Because this study is more concerned with personality characteristics and behaviors related to popularity, this review of the literature will be limited to these factors.

Personality characteristics and social behaviors were selected for several reasons. Personality characteristics seem to have the most significant relationship with peer status (Austin & Thompson, 1948; Bonney, 1943; Laughlin, 1954) and are more amenable to modification than are such characteristics as intelligence, social class, and birth order. It is also believed that there is no single variable for predicting acceptance and rejection. Hartup (1970), for example, noted that "no single trait is of overriding importance in determining children's popularity with their peers." Gronlund (1959) noted that "an individual child's sociometric status and his position in the social structure of a particular group is influenced by the total pattern of personal

characteristics he possesses, as well as by the values held by the group members." Jacobs (1970) maintained that "with social acceptability (as with leadership) a great many variables interact with given situational circumstances rather than with each other so as to determine high or low levels of sociometric acceptance." Gronlund (1959) also stated that two types of personal characteristics seem to be necessary for being highly chosen by peers: (1) prestige factors such as intelligence, achievement, skills, physical attractiveness; and (2) need satisfying behaviors such as kindness, helpfulness, considerateness, and friendliness. Similarly, Sears (1963) noted that the determinants of social acceptance seem to be of two types: (1) those abilities promoting efficient p oduction, such as mental ability and good work habits; and (2) affective characteristics associated with pleasant relationships with others, such as enthusiasm, optimistic attitudes, and consideration for others' feelings.

Yet, while high status among peers seems to depend on the entire pattern of characteristics and traits possessed by an individual, lack of acceptance among peers may be due to the absence of a single highly valued personal characteristic (Gronlund, 1959), or to the possession of a negative trait or behavior so salient and disruptive to peer interaction (e.g., physical aggression) that it is unlikely to be ignored by peers (Johnson, 1950).

Behavioral Correlates of Acceptance and Rejection

Numerous studies have been concerned with behavior and characteristics related to sociometric results. These studies have been comprehensively reviewed by Gronlund (1959) and Hartup (1970). In this section, only

those studies where personality and behavioral characteristics are associated with low or high social status will be reviewed.

Several studies have been concerned with the relationship between physical appearance and social status. These studies consistently show a positive relationship between attractiveness and popularity. Highly chosen children at the elementary level were characterized by their peers as "attractive," "neat," "good looking," and "tidy" (Austin & Thompson, 1948; Bonney, 1943; Gronlund & Anderson, 1956; Kuhlen & Lee, 1943; Moreno, 1953; Sears, 1963; Young & Cooper, 1944). Physical attractiveness was even found to be related to popularity at the pre-school level (Dion & Bershied, 1974). Rejected students, on the other hand, were characterized as physically unattractive, "not good looking," and "not clean and tidy" (Cunningham and associates, 1951; Gronlund & Anderson, 1957).

A relatively large number of studies reported in the literature investigated the relationship between aggressive behavior and sociometric status. While not all of the findings have been consistent, in particular those concerning the manner in which aggression is related to peer acceptance, they are much more uniform concerning the association between aggression and peer rejection (Hartup, 1970). Behavior such as "is mean," bullying, hitting, and fighting has been reported as characteristic of low peer status in school children (Baldwin, 1958; Gronlund & Anderson, 1957; Jennings, 1950; Johnson, 1950; Kuhlen & Lee, 1943; Moreno, 1953; Northway, 1952; Smith, 1950; Wiggins & Winder, 1961). An interesting hypothesis has been suggested regarding differences between the

aggressiveness of the accepted and the rejected child. While the accepted child sometimes exhibits aggressive behavior, this aggression tends to be more reality oriented, i.e., directed toward a source of frustration or provocation. However, the aggression of the nonpopular child seems to be unprovoked, displaced, or out of context and therefore particularly irritating to peers (Dunningham, 1957; Hartup, 1970; Moore, 1967). Verbal aggression has also been found to be more characteristic of the low status child. Lesser (1959), for example, found a negative correlation of -.45 between popularity and verbal aggression among fifth- and sixth-grade lower class boys. Similar findings were reported by Gottlieb and Budoff (1973), who found that verbal aggression was related to social rejection of both educable mentally retarded children and non-EMR children.

Other behaviors and personality characteristics frequently mentioned as more characteristic of low status or rejected students are: bossy, quarrelsome, show-off, and attention seeking (Jennings, 1950; Johnson, 1950; Laughlin, 1954); lying and cheating (Johnson, 1950); and bashfulness and shyness (Cunningham and associates, 1951; Northway, 1944).

Gronlund and Anderson (1957) found that rejected children were frequently described as possessing attributes opposite of those possessed by high status children. For example, rejected children were characterized as not likable, restless, talkative, and unattractive. Cunningham and associates (1951) also reported that rejected children were characterized as worried, scared, unhappy, and not jolly.

The neglected or isolated child was not often described in the

literature. Northway (1944) found that such children tend to be listless, lacking in vitality, and uninterested in people, activities, and events of the outside world. Gronlund and Anderson (1957) found that neglected children were characterized by their peers as being quiet and untalkative.

High social status among peers, as pointed out already (for example, Gronlund, 1959; Jacobs, 1970), seems to depend on the entire pattern of social behaviors or characteristics rather than on a single, or a few characteristics, traits or behaviors. Several studies appear to confirm this conclusion. Bonney and Powell (1953) found that in the first grade, highly accepted children were more conforming to classroom requirements, smiled more often, participated more frequently in cooperative group activity, made more voluntary contributions to their groups, and were less likely to be alone during free play and activity periods than unacceptable children. Similar results were reported at the second-grade level by Bonney (1955); children of high status talked more frequently to others, laughed and smiled more often, and participated in group activities more often in a cooperative and voluntary manner than did low status children.

In another study, Bonney (1943) compared the personality traits of fourth-grade students with high and low status. Students with high status were characterized as having "strong aggressive personality traits," such as leadership, enthusiasm, daring, active in recitation. They were also characterized by traits "essential for inter-personal contacts," such as being cheerful, friendly, tidy, good looking, happy, and at ease during contact with adults.

Kuhlen and Lee (1943), in a study of 700 children in the sixth, ninth, and twelfth grades in four different schools, reported quite similar results. Although some changes in the characteristics of high status boys and girls were reported from one grade level to the other, high status children were, in general, judged by peers as being popular, cheerful, happy, enthusiatic, friendly, able to enjoy jokes, and able to initiate games and activities.

Jennings (1950) reported quite similar findings in a training school for adolescent girls. Highly chosen girls were described more often as being cooperative, showing initiative, having an even disposition, and exhibiting behavior which contributed to the harmony and effectiveness of group living.

Very similar traits have been mentioned in studies where pupils were asked to give reasons for their sociometric choices. Austin and Thompson (1948) and Smith (1950) found that sixth-grade students selected as friends, children who were kind, cooperative, generous, honest, even tempered, polite, loyal, agreeable, modest, and obedient.

A summary of the variables associated with sociometric status is provided in Table 1.

Attempts to Modify the Status of the Low Status Child

Over the last 40 years, many general procedures or strategies have been developed and utilized to cope with the problem of individual students who are rejected and isolated in the classroom. These procedures include: (a) sociometric grouping or the "sociometric placement

Table 1

Summary of Variables Associated with Sociometric Status

Behaviors and Characteristics Associated with Rejection	Behaviors and Characteristics Associated with Acceptance
Physical Aggression Hitting Fighting Bullying Verbal Aggression Bossy Bothering Quarrelsome Attention Seeking Show-Off Physical Appearance Smells Bad Unkempt Not Tidy (Withdrawal-Depression) Shy Bashful Quiet Worried Unhappy Lying Cheating	Physical Appearance Good Looking Tidy Good Natured Happy Enjoys Everything Cheerful Takes Jokes Smiles Enthusiasm Social Virtues Honest Polite Generous Loyal Kind Considerate Social Participation and Friendliness Friendly Cooperative Helpful Dependable Responsible Volunteering Sharing Initiative

technique," in which classroom seating arrangements or classroom work groups are arranged or rearranged according to the children's preferences as expressed in the sociometric test (Amundsom, 1954; Atkinson, 1949; Cunningham and associates, 1951; Gronlund, 1955; Kinney, 1953; Moreno, 1953; Spector, 1953; Taba & Elkins, 1950); (b) assignment of responsible tasks or leading roles, e.g., assigning a student as chairman of the hospitality committee (Grace, 1966; McLelland & Ratliff, 1950; Smith, 1950); (c) individual counseling (Amundsom, 1954; Kranzler, Mayer, Dyer & Munger, 1966); and (d) the introduction of a more general classroom program for teaching intergroup understanding or social relations, including subject matter content such as social studies and literature, guidance, creation of a permissive and relating atmosphere, use of diagnostic techniques, stories, and roleplaying (Cunningham and associates, 1951; Taba & Elkins, 1950).

Most of the different approaches or techniques utilized to change peer status are, in general, difficult to evaluate because the majority were reported by single teachers working solely with their own classes, or because they lacked adequate experimental controls (Guskin & Chaires, 1966; Lilly, 1971).

In addition to the approaches and procedures previously reviewed, several more carefully controlled research studies on improving the social status of unpopular pupils were reported in the literature. Many of these studies were conducted in a contrived situation or in an experimental setting outside the classroom. Others worked more closely with, or in, the classroom setting itself. For example, Lott and Lott (1960)

established an experimental setting outside the classroom in which 48 children (grades three and five) who did not choose each other on a sociometric test, played together in groups of three on a game called "Rocket Ship." They found that those children rewarded for their performance during the game (i.e., those who experienced reward in the presence of their peers) developed positive attitudes (as measured by positive choices on a sociometric test) toward their fellow group members. Similarly, Blau and Rafferty (1970) found a significant increase in the sociometric ranks of pre-school children who worked in pairs on a cooperative task (button pressing) and were jointly reinforced by candies. However, the study did not support their hypothesis that social status is affected by reinforcement schedules.

Flanders and Havumaki (1963) studied the effects of teacher reinforcement given in the presence of peers. Subjects were tenth graders who, in 33 groups of 10 each, discussed whether they would like to appear on a television or radio program. A teacher-trainer in 17 groups verbally praised certain children for their contribution to the group discussion. In the remaining 16 groups, the teacher-trainer praised the group as a whole for ideas contributed by individual members. The findings indicated that children who had been individually praised were significantly more accepted by their peers following treatment. Praise given to the group as a whole was not effective in changing social status.

Retish (1968) investigated the effects of reward or verbal reinforcement used by teachers in their classrooms as a method for modifying pupil acceptance. Four students in 20 classrooms in grades two and five whom

teachers and students both identified as rejected were selected for the study. Subjects in each classroom were assigned to one of two experimental conditions (N=40), while the other two in each classroom served as controls (N=40). Retish then examined two ways of modifying acceptance. In one instance, he provided teachers with verbal information which suggested that some children had "potential to do better." In the other, he requested that the teacher positively reinforce the selected children for their positive academic or affective behavior in front of the class three times a day for three weeks. The results indicated that identification alone was not enough to alter the social position of the poorly accepted child. However, students in the reinforcement group made significantly greater gains in their social acceptance scores than did the control group subjects.

A later study by Jacobs (1970) supports Retish's finding that identification alone is not enough to alter social acceptance. Jacobs found that the introduction of teacher expectancy as the independent variable did not produce changes in the acceptance of children identified as "showing an unusual promise to emerge as stars or leaders in the classroom."

Alden, Pettigrew, and Skiba (1970) also studied two effects of reinforcement on popularity. In five, seventh-grade classrooms, the nine least choosen children were assigned to one of three experimental conditions; (1) an individual contingent group reinforcement condition where the teacher gave a combination of verbal reinforcement to the low child and some extra credit to the whole class following his/her correct answer,

(2) a verbal reinforcement condition in which the teacher only reinforced the low child verbally for his/her correct answers, and (3) a control condition. Two experimental 45-minute sessions were given each day over a period of 20 days. The teacher asked questions during each session. A significant increase in the positive attitudes of peers toward the least chosen children was found in the individual contingent group reinforcement condition, but verbal reinforcement alone did not produce a significant change.

Another approach was used by Chaires (1966), who studied whether or not the social status of unpopular children could be changed by participation in "specially organized cooperative group activities." She identified the four lowest status children in each of 16 special classes. These classes included eight at the intermediate level and eight at the junior high level. In half of the classrooms, two of the four lowest status children were chosen randomly to take part in the experimental program, and the other two were identified as within class controls. In the remaining half of the classrooms, all four lowest status children were used as "outside" controls. The experimental subjects, along with two of the most popular classmates, were removed from the classroom twice weekly for 15-minute sessions over a period of five weeks to practice a skit. The skit was then presented to the classroom. The sociometric test given at the conclusion of the program revealed that the low status students improved significantly in their sociometric status in comparison with both the within and the outside class control groups.

Lilly (1971) used the same treatments as Chaires (1966) but went a

step further by trying to experimentally isolate and control variables possibly related to the improvement in social status found in Chaires' (1966) study. Furthermore, Lilly assessed the stability of gains over a six-week follow-up period. His subjects were 48 children, two from each of 24 regular fourth-fifth- and sixth-grade classrooms, who were lowest in peer acceptance and in achievement. Six experimental treatment groups were employed as controls for different factors: (1) a full impact treatment in which two low students worked with two popular classmates on a project in which movies were made to be shown to the class. The treatment was administered twice weekly for 15 minutes each over a five week period; (2) an experimental impact treatment to test the effect of an adult experimenter; (3) a peer impact treatment to test the impact of an interaction with high acceptance peers; (4) a minimal impact treatment to test the effect of participation in a skit before the class; (5) a within classroom treatment to test the effect of the general increased saliency of the experimental children for the other members of the class; and (6) a full control condition. The results indicated that all experimental treatments, taken as a group, yielded gains in social acceptance superior to those of the nontreatment controls. However, the difference was no longer significant after six weeks.

The maintenance of gain scores in social acceptability was also studied by Rucker and Vincenzo (1970). Using the same type of intervention as Chaires (1966), they found that the treatment resulted in significant gains in acceptance scores for the experimental group. However, as in Lilly's (1971) study, the differences between the two groups were no longer significant one month later.

It is important to note that very few studies have used roleplaying to change the social status of unpopular children. Furthermore, the effect of roleplaying is hard to evaluate in some studies because role-playing was included as a part of a more general program (Cunningham and associates, 1951; Taba & Elkins, 1950), no control group was used, and the number of participating classrooms was very small. Cartenson (1955) reported a short role-playing intervention over a six-week period as a method for changing the behavior of one rejected child. The boy was treated in the experimenter's room by the "auxiliary chair technique."[2] Following the intervention, the boy was shown by the sociometric test to be much more liked by his classmates. It is difficult to draw any conclusion from this study about the effect of role-playing on social status because it is a report about a single case and because it is impossible to judge what really contributed to the change.

In a more controlled study, Souerwine and Conway (1953) introduced role-playing sessions into the classroom to improve the social interaction of a small group of sixth-grade boys. The subjects were divided into two groups, with 16 boys in the experimental group and 13 in the control group. The experimentals participated in four role-playing sessions of 50 minutes each, one week apart. The results indicated that,

---

[2]In the "auxiliary chair technique," the roleplaying of an episode is done with chairs to represent the various characters or behaviors to be analyzed. Name tags attached to the chairs differentiate one role from another. The director or demonstrator stands behind the chair to facilitate the projection of words, feelings, actions, and thoughts into the chair." (Lippitt, 1958, p. 8).

although neither measurement of social interaction showed a significant difference between groups, there was a trend toward a greater degree of social interaction in the experimental group than in the control group. Because no significant differences were found, and because the study was conducted with only a small group of boys, it is again difficult to draw any conclusions about the effectiveness of roleplaying as a method for changing social status.

A few additional studies in which play therapy was used to change social status are reported in the literature. Cox (1953) used play therapy based on the principles advocated by Axline (1947) to modify adjustment problems of children in an Australian orphange. His subjects were 18 children ages 5 to 13, nine in the experimental group and nine in the control group. The play therapy lasted over a period of 10 weeks. The results of the treatment indicated a significant change in the adjustment of experimental subjects as measured by their higher scores on a sociometric test. The change, however, was significant only in the eldest group. The global nature of the therapeutic treatment and the small sample used in the study again make it difficult to generalize about the use of roleplaying as an educational tool in the classroom.

In summary, a number of conclusions can be drawn from the research literature reviewed in this chapter. Studies designed to increase positive attitudes of peers toward the least accepted children in contrived situations or specifically designed experimental settings have been relatively successful. However, one must question how much similarity exists between experimental settings and an actual classroom. The results must also be interpreted cautiously because all sociometric measures used

in the past were given immediately after the termination of the specific treatment, and no follow-up was conducted to test how long positive attitudes were maintained after the children returned to their classroom. The classroom studies reviewed indicate that peer acceptance can be improved through specific intervention programs. However, a number of variables should be considered when interpreting the results of those studies. In several studies, children were removed from their classrooms and taught social skills by a researcher. While this approach had encouraging outcomes, interventions in which the teacher provides the treatment are more promising from an economical point of view. Furthermore, the teacher is more likely to produce a change in interaction patterns in the classroom. Virtually no studies attempted to identify or modify those specific behaviors and characteristics that seem to contribute to the major causes of low social acceptance. Gottlieb and Davis (1973), Gronlund and Anderson (1957), and Lilly (1971) have pointed out the need for this type of approach. The most discouraging finding in all studies reviewed was the fact that changes in social status tended to be short lived. Whenever posttests were given a few weeks after the intervention, differences between experimental and control subjects could no longer be identified.

Roleplaying as an Intervention Technique

Psychodrama was first "explored and implemented as a diagnostic and therapeutic procedure" by Moreno (1946). Since psychodrama's introduction to the United States in 1925, a number of methods including therapeutipsychodrama, sociodrama, exiodrama, roleplaying, analytic

psychodrama, and various modifications of these, have been developed (Moreno, 1946). While psychodrama is a therapeutic approach concerned with the private personality of the patient and his/her catharsis, sociopsychodrama, or sociodrama, is concerned with individuals treated as collective representatives of community roles and role relations, not with their private roles and role relations (Moreno, 1946).

Roleplaying has been defined by Lippitt and Hubbell (1956) as "a temporary stepping out of ones own present role to assume the role of another individual, of one's self at another time, of an animal or even of an inanimate object. In assuming another role one tries to feel like, sound like, and behave like the individual or object that one is attempting to portray" (p. 89). A more descriptive definition of forms roleplaying might take in the educational setting was offered by Shaftel and Shaftel (1967). They described roleplaying as follows:

> "It is the opportunity to explore through spontaneous (that is unrehearsed) improvisation and carefully guided discussion, typical group problem situations in which individuals are helped to become sensitive to the feelings of the people involved where the consequences of choices made are delineated by the group and where members are helped to explore the kinds of behavior that society will sanction. In this process young people are guided to become sensitive to feelings, to the personal consequences of the choices they make, and to the consequences of those choices for other people. The group members practice many roles or different approaches to roles, and gradually they develop skill for solving problems of social conduct and interpersonal relations" (p. 86).

The role-playing technique has been widely used for different purposes in a variety of settings. An extensive review of the literature and research on the usefulness of roleplaying was conducted by Lippitt and Hubbell (1956). Their review indicated seven general uses for role-playing:

(1) For improving interpersonal and intercultural relations. Examples of the use of role playing for these purposes are found in settings such as classrooms, religious groups, communities, hospitals, the family, guidance clinics, settlement houses, and industry.

(2) For changing attitudes and behavior. Examples are found in education (attitude change of teachers and students), in industry, in the military, and in prisons.

(3) For stimulating group participation, involvement in training, and interest in academic subjects. The effectiveness of roleplaying in achieving these purposes has been demonstrated in psychotherapy and in a variety of job training situations such as training of foremen, interviewers, counselors, social case workers, nurses, rabbis.

(4) For developing spontaneity. Role playing and spontaneity training were found to be very useful in particular with retarded children in helping them to react more effectively in social situations.

(5) For personnel selection and situational diagnosis. Role playing is used in the selection of job candidates; for encouraging patients to project their feelings and difficulties; and as a diagnostic aid.

(6) For helping individuals with inner conflicts and problems. Role playing is used as a therapeutic method in hospital settings in treating psychiatric patients. It is also used in guidance clinics in helping both children and adults.

(7) In research. Role playing is used in exploring methodological questions, such as the investigation of whether role playing is a reliable method for diagnosis. Other examples are research on personality characteristics, and investigations of the conditions under which learning takes place.

Chesler and Fox (1966) summarized some of potential advantages of using role-playing techniques in the classroom: (1) the role-playing experience can give rise to greater individual spontaneity and creativity in previously repressed or inhibited children, (2) the experience may result in greater individual insights into behavior and a better understanding of the place of rules and behavioral standards, (3) children may begin to understand the effects of their behavior on others and gain significant information about the motivations for their own and others' behavior, (4) the increased opportunity for understanding oneself and others can pave the way for behavioral change, (5) roleplaying can be used to demonstrate problems between and among people and groups, (6) roleplaying that helps individuals to understand their own and others' behavior can free them to utilize their intellectual potential more fully, and (7) roleplaying may prove to be an instructional technique particularly useful with lower class students.

One additional important advantage of the role-playing technique has been its potential in stimulating and encouraging thinking and in promoting problem-solving abilities (Buchan, 1972; Dinkmyer, 1973; Grambs, 1968; Klein, 1956; Shaftel & Shaftel, 1967).

Roleplaying as a teaching methodology has also been found to be very

useful when used with exceptional children, particularly those who are educable mentally retarded (Buchan, 1972; Bryer & Wagner, 1961; Moreno, 1953; Sarbin, 1957).

Although roleplaying has great potential for use in education, this technique has been used infrequently in the classroom itself (Chesler & Fox, 1966; Grambs, 1968; Riessman, 1964). Several reasons have been given for this infrequent use of roleplaying. Grambs (1968), for example, indicated that the method requires a teacher who is sensitive to the feelings of the group and is able to accept any direction the roleplaying may take. She pointed out that a teacher who uses roleplaying must be comfortable with ambiguity and uncertainty (which many are not). Another reason has been the resistance of teachers against using the technique in their classroom for fear that one might "accuse" them of trying to introduce mental health materials or programs into the schools (Chesler & Fox, 1966; Grambs, 1968; Riessman, 1964). Lack of real knowledge of roleplaying and its uses on the part of teachers has also been indicated (Chesler & Fox, 1966; Dinkmeyer, 1973).

On the basis of previous literature and in light of the many advantages of the role-playing technique for teachers and their students, this study adopted roleplaying as an intervention method. An attempt was made in this study to cope with some of the problems and inadequacies of previous investigations. First, the study was conducted in the classroom by the teacher. It had previously been demonstrated that the teacher is an important variable influencing the social acceptability of his/her pupils (Flanders & Havumaki, 1963; Retish, 1968). Therefore, it was

recommended that teachers continue to use roleplaying after the study as a continuous program or whenever problems in peer relationship arise in the classroom. Second, the intervention was conducted on the entire classroom rather than a selected group of unpopular children. Several writers have pointed out the need for working with the whole group to aid the rejected and isolated member gain more acceptance (Cunningham and associates, 1951; Gronlund, 1959; Taba, 1954). Cartenson (1955) noted that changes in the behavior of low status child that enhance peer acceptance are likely to be reinforced by them, which may then stabilize this change. Third, an attempt was made to identify the behaviors that produce low social acceptance and then develop a program to modify those behaviors. Four, a large number of classrooms and subjects were selected to participate in the program. Five, the impact of the intervention was not measured immediately after the termination of the program but one or two weeks later.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: (a) Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score higher than those in the control group on the peer acceptance score following the role-playing intervention.

(b) Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score lower than those in the control group on the peer rejection score following the role-playing intervention.

(c) Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score lower (more positively) than those in the control group on the acceptance minus rejection score (the net score) following the role playing intervention.

Hypothesis 2: (a) Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score higher than those in the control group on the positive ratings on the teacher rating scale following the role playing intervention.

(b) Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score lower than those in the control group on the negative ratings on the teacher rating scale following the role playing intervention.

Hypothesis 3: (a) Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score lower (less negatively) than those in the control group on the scores obtained from peer judgments on the Reputation Test following the role playing intervention.[3]

(b) Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score higher (more positively) than those in the control group on the scores obtained from their

---

[3]Negative scores on the Reputation Test indicate that peers tend to attribute more negative traits to a child than positive traits.

self nominations on the Reputation Test following the role playing intervention.[4]

Hypothesis 4: Low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score higher than those in the control group on the Social Problem Solving Test scores following the role playing intervention.

---

[4]Positive scores on the self nomination scale indicate that a child nominates himself more on the positive characteristics than on the negative characteristics.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Overview

The study was conducted in 65 third- through fifth-grade classrooms in two school districts in Indiana. Intact classrooms were randomly assigned either to the experimental or the control conditions.

The study target population was the four most unpopular students in each classroom. In the first stage of the study during the fall semester of 1973, a "Teacher Training Manual" in roleplaying and related materials was prepared. In the second and major stage (spring, 1974), a roleplaying program was implemented over a period of 10 weeks in the experimental classrooms by the teachers. Prior to the implementation of the program, and at the end of the intervention, a battery of tests was administered in all classrooms. Testing included a Sociometric Test, a Reputation Test, and a Teacher-Rating Scale. At the end of the program a Problem-Solving Test was also administered to a selected group of students.

The Sample

The study was conducted in third- through fifth-grade classrooms in two school districts in southern Indiana with populations of approximately 12,000 and 25,000. In this study, these communities are referred to as District A and B, respectively. In District A, all 22 third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade classrooms in four elementary schools were randomly assigned to either the experimental or control conditions.

In School District B, almost all of the third-, fourth-, and fifth-

grade classrooms (N=43) in eight elementary schools participated.[5] Half of the classrooms were again randomly assigned to the experimental condition and half to the control condition: 21 were experimental classrooms and 22 were control classrooms. The total number of experimental classrooms in both districts was 32; the total number of control classrooms was 33.

The decision to choose third- through fifth-grade children was based on theoretical formulations and empirical findings which indicated that interpersonal communication skills and role-taking ability[6] show the greatest rise in performance during ages 8 to 11 (Feffer & Gourevitch, 1960; Flavell and associates, 1968; Piaget, 1950; Piaget and Inhelder, 1969).

In each classroom, the four most unpopular children were identified based on their high negative net scores on the sociometric test. While the decision to choose the four most unpopular subjects in a classroom as the target population was made arbitrarily, it should be pointed out that no agreed upon criteria for choosing the most rejected subjects are found in the literature. Almost every researcher tends to establish his/her

---

[5]The district has 16 elementary schools. Eight schools planned to implement another program called "Inside Out" during that semester, and, therefore, were not included.

[6]Role-taking is a term instituted by Mead (1934). To him, the term meant a mental, cognitive, or empathic ability (not an overt behavior or conduct) by which a person pretends that he is another person or "puts himself in the other's place" in order to gain insight into the person's probable behavior in a given situation (Coutu, 1951).

own criteria. For example, Northway (1944) identified the most rejected children as those who fall into the lowest quartile. Jennings (1950) identified the "under chosen" as those who fall more than one standard deviation below the group mean. Croft and Grygier (1956) identified the six boys with the lowest scores as the most rejected, and Chaires (1966) identified four subjects with the lowest scores. Kuhlen and Lee (1943) chose 25% of the least popular children, and Buswell (1953) selected her rejected group as those subjects who were in the upper 27% on the rejection score. Bronfenbrenner (1945) proposed a constant frame of reference against which sociometric scores can be compared. This chance model makes it possible to identify persons who receive significantly more or significantly fewer choices than could be expected by chance. However, the table of the "critical raw status scores" can only be used when positive criteria or questions are used in the sociometric test.

This short review demonstrates that the decision to choose the subjects, while arbitrarily made, does not differ in that respect from similar decisions made by other researchers.

Experimental Procedures

The study was conducted in two main stages. In the first stage, instructional materials for training teachers in role-playing technique were developed. The materials included a teacher training manual in which the use of several role-playing techniques and activities was explained and described. In addition, 32 problem stories were adapted or modified for the purposes of the study. Also, several materials were prepared to go along with the manual and the stories. Those materials

included pictures, name tags, and short briefings to the roleplayers. In the second stage, teachers were trained to use the developed materials. The program was then implemented in 32 experimental classrooms over a period of 10 weeks.

The Development of the Instructional Materials

The teacher training manual developed for this project incorporated many of the ideas formulated by Chesler and Fox (1966), Dinkmeyer (1970, 1973), and Shaftel and Shaftel (1967). Ideas for the development of materials which related to the specific objectives of the study (pictures, name-tags, and briefings) were adapted. The most important activity was the adaptation of the stories from these three major sources. The decision regarding which story to adapt or modify was made on the basis of a review of the literature in which behaviors and characteristics relating to social acceptance or social rejection were identified and summarized.

In all 32, stories were adapted, modified, or specifically written for the project.[7] The major themes of these stories were behaviors, actions, or personal characteristics that aid and facilitate friendship patterns as well as behaviors, actions, and personal characteristics that seem to disrupt peer interaction or friendship patterns. The list of the stories adapted and the behaviors and characteristics addressed in each of them are presented in Table 41 in Appendix G. While the major objective of this study was to change pupils' attitudes and behaviors,

[7]The stories were adapted or reproduced by the permission of the publishers and the authors. (See Appendix H).

classroom teachers were perceived as the agents of the expected changes. Therefore, much of the effort in developing the instructional materials and the training program was directed toward the teacher population.

Several crucial factors were considered in the development of the teacher manual. A detailed explanation and many examples were given to point out the uses and benefits of roleplaying in the classroom. Differences between roleplaying and psychotherapy were emphasized. Existing sources on roleplaying (Chesler & Fox, 1966; Dinkmeyer, 1970, 1973; Shaftel & Shaftel, 1967) were used as models for the language style, content, and the sequence of role-playing steps built into the training manual.

Pupils' characteristics were taken into account, particularly in the content and language of the adapted stories, in the guidelines given to the teachers for presenting the problem story before the class, and in the related materials developed (pictures, name tags, and briefings).

The stage of concept and task analysis for this study included the identification of role-playing elements the teachers were expected to acquire. The knowledge and skills for using roleplaying in the classroom were broken down into numerous different possible activities, and into a suggested sequence of steps. All the activities, role-playing formats, and each of the steps were described and explained in detail by identifying their relevant attributes and by providing examples. (See Appendix H)

A checklist of the classroom activities, role-playing formats, and sequence of steps was then prepared for each teacher. This list served both as a short guide for the teacher each time he/she used roleplaying in the class-

room, and as a check on the extent to which the different role-playing activities were actually implemented. The teachers completed the above self-reports after each role-playing session. (See "Lesson Activities and Evaluation Sheet" in Appendix F.)

A detailed outline of roleplaying techniques and formats was prepared with the help of several major publications on roleplaying (Buchan, 1972; Chesler & Fox, 1966; Corsini & Cardone, 1966; Dinkmeyer, 1970, 1973; Grambs, 1968; Klein, 1956; Lehman, 1971; Lippitt, 1958; Lippitt & Hubbell, 1956; Maier, 1952; Moreno, 1946; Shaftel & Shaftel, 1967). The roleplaying techniques or formats included in the manual because of their applicability to the classroom were:

(1) Simple roleplaying
(2) The role reversal techniques
(3) The soliloquy technique
(4) The double technique
(5) The consultant
(6) Multiple roleplayers
(7) Multiple enactments
(8) The new role[8]
(9) The auxiliary chair technique[9]

A general sequence of steps found to be effective by Chesler and Fox (1966), Dinkmeyer (1970), Klein (1956), Lippitt and Hubbell (1956), and Shaftel and Shaftel (1967) was also recommended to the teachers to be

---

[8]The name is not used in the literature. It stands for the active stepping into the scene by the director of the roleplaying session (the teacher in this program.)

[9]The technique was developed by Lippitt (1958) and adapted for the study.

followed during implementation of the role-playing sessions. This sequence included the following steps:[10]

(1) Warm-up exercises
(2) Introduction or presentation of the problem (the story)
(3) Explanation of the general situation (setting up the stage)
(4) Selection of participants, and explaining their roles
(5) Explaining audience roles
(6) Roleplaying or role enactment
(7) Discussion

The following steps were also included:

(8) Further enactment (re-enactment)
(9) Summary[11]

A detailed explanation was given for each step, and the teachers were encouraged to use this sequence. However, it was also explained that the training manual should be read or studied as a general guide, and that it was up to each teacher to decide which formats or techniques to use, based on expediency, competence, and ability of students. For example, warm-ups could be dropped when the teacher felt the students had become open to the program. Other examples included the selection of a role-playing format or a discussion format.

The second part of the manual included 32 problem stories adapted or modified for this study. Each of the stories contained a controversy, a conflict, or a problem school children are likely to face while interacting

---

[10] Different terms, as well as slight modifications of these steps, can be found in different publications.

[11] The "summary" step has been included in this study instead of the "evaluation" step.

with each other. The stories had no endings, leaving the class at a dilemma point. The use of open-ended stories as a valuable medium in roleplaying was introduced by Shaftel and Shaftel (1967). As they pointed out, "the problem story provides a structured situation which, while representative of children's actual experiences, provides an often necessary 'remove' that makes exploration easier because the situation is not too close to be faced, one that is, in other words, not an actual threat in the lives of the group. Furthermore, such stories present dramatic spring boards which quickly involve the group in roleplaying, and do not demand as much initial skill in introductory warm-up techniques on the part of the teacher" (p. 75).

Preliminary Field Test - Formative Evaluation

During the Fall semester of 1973, over a period of 2 1/2 months, a preliminary field test was conducted. During this period, the first draft of the manual and materials was piloted in a third, fourth, and fifth grade classroom in a school in Martinsville, Indiana. The investigator trained the three teachers in the use of the role-playing techniques and activities and gave each the first draft of the manual.

Once a week, an informal observation in the three classrooms was conducted during the role-playing sessions. The purpose of these observations, and the discussions which followed the observations, was to get teacher feedback about the manual and the materials, as well as her feelings about the role-playing session. The observations also provided input on teacher performance so that suggestions about the use of a different form of discussion or a different form of roleplaying could be incorporated

in the final manual. It was emphasized that the purpose of the observations and discussion was not to test the teachers, but to get feedback and comments from them which could be used to modify and change the manual, the stories, and the materials.

The Intervention Program (Main Field Test)

At the beginning of the spring semester, 1974, a workshop was offered to the experimental teachers in the two school districts participating in the study. Workshops were given on different week days immediately after school in small groups of 6 to 10 teachers each. The experimental teachers from two to three adjacent schools usually met in one school building serving as host. Because of their interest in the program, most of the principals took part in the workshop. (For a brief outline of the workshop, see Appendix L). The major purposes of the workshop were: (1) to teach the teachers a variety of methods and techniques of roleplaying so they would acquire both the knowledge and the skills required for implementing the program; (2) to help the teachers overcome some of their fears or reluctance in using the technique with their pupils; (3) to familiarize the teachers with the training manual and its parts, as well as with the materials (pictures, name tags, and briefings) and their uses during the role-playing sessions; and (4) to familiarize the teachers with the general purposes of the study, the length of time of the intervention, and other practical issues. It was emphasized that the teachers were not to discuss the program with the control teachers in the school building. However, they, as well as the principals, were assured that the control teachers would be given an opportunity after the study to

become familiar with the program and, if possible, to participate in a workshop.[12]

The length of each workshop was approximately two hours. While the project was in operation, the director and his assistants met with each of the experimental teachers on a weekly or bi-weekly basis during the entire period. The purposes of these meetings were to answer teacher questions and solve problems that arose during the role-playing sessions in the classrooms. Another purpose was to assure that teachers acquired the basic knowledge and skills of roleplaying and implemented them in their classes.

No specific test was developed to measure the teacher skills and knowledge of role-playing activities, techniques, formats, or steps. However, an evaluation checklist which included all the activities, formats, and steps of roleplaying was prepared. This was a self-report instrument on which the teacher checked his/her classroom activities. (See "Data Collection Instruments" in the next section, and Lesson Activities and Evaluation sheet in Appendix F.)

The intervention lasted for approximately 10 weeks. Each of the experimental teachers was asked to plan two role-playing sessions per week. The recommended length of time of each session was 30 minutes. This is the optimal length of time recommended in the literature for effective roleplaying with elementary school children (Lippitt & Hubbell, 1956).

---

[12] The workshops with the control teachers did not materialize because it was too late in the school year. However, the purposes of the program, the role-playing intervention, and the testing results were presented and discussed with each of them.

Data Collection Instruments

A Sociometric Measure

"The sociometric test is an instrument which examines social structures through the measurement of attractions and repulsion which takes place between individuals within a group" (Moreno, 1953, p. 93). Since its development by Moreno (1953), the test has been, and still is, widely used in schools, industry, summer camps, prisons, and other places where interpersonal relations are of interest (Gronlund, 1959).

Persons taking the test are required to choose a limited (forced choice) or an unlimited number of associates for some group situation or activity. Usually, the test includes only positive choices. However, negative choices and criteria have also been used. While several authors (Bronfenbrenner, 1945; Cunningham and associates, 1951; Northway, 1952) have noted that the use of negative criteria is undesirable because individuals may become more conscious of their feelings of rejection, others have indicated some advantages in using both positive and negative criteria. Gronlund (1959) noted that the use of negative criteria is sometimes necessary for teaching and research purposes. Moore (1967) pointed out that giving only positive choices might not differentiate between the disliked and the isolated children. When negative criteria are used, however, the actively rejected child is likely to get negative choices, but the overlooked or isolated child is not. In this study, negative criteria have been included to differentiate between rejected and isolated pupils. To eliminate some disturbing effects of these

criteria for the negative judgments pupils were asked to write down the names of children they "are not sure" they would like to participate with in a certain activity.

All children in this study were asked to make three positive and three negative choices of a seating companion, work companion, and play companion (see The Social Relations Scale, Appendix F) from their respective classrooms.

The sociometric tests were administered by the teachers as a group test. Each child was given a test sheet and a list of the pupils in his/her classroom. The children were assured that the results were to be used for research purposes only, and that no one in the class would have access to their test responses.

Test Analysis

The results of the sociometric test were analyzed in two main steps. In the first step, all the answers of the pupils in each classroom were recorded in a matrix table. The positive and negative choices each child received from his peers were then summarized and placed on a summary sheet. No distinction was made between the first, second, and third choices made. Although several investigators tend to recommend the assignment of arbitrary weights to the various choice levels (Croft & Grygier, 1956), others do not find any experimental evidence to justify this method (Gronlund, 1959; Lindzey & Byrne, 1968).

Three raw scores were derived for each child from the summary sheet: (1) a score for the number of peers who chose him/her on the positive questions, (2) a score for the number of peers who chose him/her on the

negative questions, and (3) a score obtained from the algebraic summation of the positive choices and the negative choices.

These raw scores were then converted into the following three indices (see Proctor & Loomis, 1951):

(1) Choice status or choice index

$$CSi = \frac{\text{No. of persons choosing}}{N - 1} \times 100,$$

(2) Rejection status or rejection index

$$RSi = \frac{\text{No. of persons rejecting}}{N - 1} \times 100, \text{ and}$$

(3) Choice - rejection status[13] or net score

$$(C\text{-}RS) = CSi - RSi.$$

The Reliability and Validity of the Sociometric Test

Several comprehensive reviews concerning the reliability and validity of the sociometric test can be found in Gronlund (1959), Mouton, Blake and Fruchter (1955a, 1955b), and Lindzey and Byrne (1968). The reliability of sociometric results has generally been determined by traditional methods used in psychological testing. These methods include measures of internal consistency, measures of consistency over time, and measures of consistency in equivalent forms of measurement.

Studies of the internal consistency of sociometric results reported high reliability coefficients in the 80's and 90's (Gronlund, 1959; Lindzey

---

[13] This score, also called the "Total Popularity Index" or the "Popularity Status Index" is quite widely used in sociometric research (see Dion & Berschied, 1974; Grossman & Wrighter, 1948; Hartup, Glazer & Charlesworth, 1967; McDavid & Harari, 1966; McKinney, 1948; Moore, 1967).

& Byrne, 1968). Studies of the consistency of sociometric results indicated a significant degree of stability over varying periods of time (Gronlund, 1959; Mouton, Blake, & Fruchter, 1955a). However, several factors were found to be associated with the magnitude of the reliability: the time span between tests, age of subjects, the relevancy of criteria used, the number of discriminations required, the length of acquaintance between group members, the size of the group, and the technique used. Furthermore, the sociometric structure of a group tends to be less stable than the sociometric status of individual members, and fluctuations in status are more marked in the middle positions of the status hierarchy than in either high or low positions (Mouton, Blake, & Fruchter, 1955a). Regarding the validity of the sociometric test, some difficulties have been encountered when using the term because there is little agreement regarding what the sociometric test is supposed to measure (Gronlund, 1959; Lindzey & Byrne, 1968). However, Gronlund (1959) indicated that a more useful question than whether the test measures what it purports to measure is the question of the extent to which the results relate to significant independent measures of interest to the theorist and the investigator.

Mouton, Blake, and Fruchter (1955b) reviewed research in which sociometric responses were studied to determine their relationship with performance criteria. They concluded from the research evidence that the number of positive choices on a sociometric test does predict such criteria as productivity, combat effectiveness, training ability, and leadership. The inverse relation was confirmed in several studies that

showed number of choices received to be correlated negatively with such behaviors as accident proness, sick day attendance, and frequency of disciplinary offences. Similarly, Gronlund (1959) concluded from his review of the literature in the field of education that, "in general, studies have shown that sociometric results are significantly related to the actual behavior of pupils, to teachers judgments of pupils' social acceptance, to adult ratings of pupils social adjustment, to the reputation pupils hold among their peers, to specific problems of social adjustment, and within limits, to problems of personal adjustment" (p. 183).

"Who Are They?"Test or the Reputation Test

This test was first devised by Hartshorne. May, and Maller (1929) in connection with their investigation of service and altruism among school children. Tryon (1939) adapted and modified the original version. Since then, the test, with some modification, has been widely used (e.g., Cunningham and associates, 1951; Gronlund, 1959; Laughlin, 1954; Sears & Sherman, 1964; Tuddenham, 1951, 1952; Wiggins & Winder, 1961). The test consists of a series of short behavioral descriptions presented with the instruction that the children guess which of their classmates is most nearly like the person described in each item or description. The items are generally arranged in pairs of opposites, one designating the positive or desirable pole of behavior, the other designating the undesirable pole among the same dimension. From the original test developed by Tryon (1939), 13 of the 20 pairs most relevant to the present study were retained.

The shorter version, with its 13 items (or 26 questions), took

approximately 30-35 minutes. Teachers were asked to read each question to the class. Children were supplied with the list of names and numbers, and asked to write down the numbers of three children in the classroom who fit each description.

Test analysis. The test was analyzed in two steps. First, all the answers or nominations given by the children in each class (including self-nominations) were tabulated. Then, the scores for each child were summarized. These scores included the number of times a child was nominated by his/her peers on each of the positive items, and the number of times the child was nominated by his peers on each of the negative items. Since each of the 13 item pairs was treated as a single dimension, a child obtained 13 scores derived from the algebraic summation of the positive and the negative mentions he received on an item pair, divided by the number of children in the classroom (excluding the child himself), and multipled by 100.

In addition to the 13 separate scores for the test, each child received a total score for the test by averaging the 13 scores. The second set of scores for each child, derived from the Reputation Test, were the self-nomination scores. Here again, each child received 13 scores derived from the algebraic summation of the favorable self-nominations minus the unfavorable self-nominations on each of the 13 pairs of items. A child also received a total score derived by totaling the 13 separate scores.

Reliability

Tryon (1939) reported a reliability coefficient of .75 and above in a test-retest for the majority of traits in an adolescent population (12-

and 15- year-olds). Many of the coefficients, however, were in the mid-80's and even in the mid-90's. Using the split-half method (Spearman, Brown formula), Tryon reported that most coefficients ranged again in the 80's to the 90's. Similar findings were reported by Tuddenham (1952). He reported a mean coefficient of .77 in a test-retest over a two-month period between an individual test and a group test administered in a fifth grade. Using the split half method, he reported average reliability coefficients of .55 in the first grade, .72 in the third grade, and .81 in the fifth grade. In a more recent study, Brozovich (1970) reported median reliability coefficients after a short interval (two and five days) that ranged from .74 to .96.

Validity. Several investigators have tested the validity of the instrument by comparing the opinions of the children with an outside criterion, usually teacher judgments (concurrent validity). Tryon (1939) noted that children tended to regard each other as adult observers did, but that many discrepancies between the two were found (no correlation coefficients were given). On the other hand, Tuddenham (1952) found that the agreement between teachers' judgment and children's opinions increased in direct relationship to the age of the group, and that the agreement was better for boys than for girls. He also found that there were differences in agreement on individual items. For example, on some items such as "leader," "bossy," and "popular," the agreement was the highest. The bi-serial correlation between pupils opinions and teacher judgments reached the value of .60 in his study. Laughlin (1954) reported correlations of a similar magnitude between children's social status and peer-nominations. The correlations ranged from .40 to .60.

Teacher Rating Scale (The Social Behaviors Rating Scale)

Teachers rated the children on the same behaviors or characteristics as the children themselves did on the Reputation Test. Each child was rated on a five-point scale. For each of the fourteen behaviors eight behaviors were identified as socially desirable and six as socially undesirable (see Social Behavior's Rating Scale, Appendix F). Each child received two scores on the scale: a total score for the eight desirable behaviors and a total score for the six undesirable behaviors.

Teacher ratings or nominations of the children were used by Tuddenham (1952) and found to be useful in evaluating the adequacy of the individual child's social adjustment and the social climate to which he/she must adjust.

"What Would You Do?" A Social Problem Solving Test

This short test was developed for this study in order to measure the ability to solve human relations problems. The test consists of six problem situations which the child may experience in his/her everyday life. For each question, the subject is asked to think of as many alternative solutions as possible (see Appendix F). Several of the questions have been adapted from Getzels' and Jackson's (1962) test "Do You Agree?" Although they developed the test as a measure of the "moral character" of gifted adolescents, the questions are excellent examples of social situations in which a child is challenged to come up with one or more solutions. In the original test, each question was followed by four alternative courses of action. The testees were asked to indicate which course of action they would advise the person faced with the choice to

take. In the "What Would You Do?" test, the questions were open ended (no alternative courses of action were given), and the testees were asked to indicate how many alternative solutions they could devise if they were in the place of the child in the story.

In its early stage of development, the test was piloted in two classrooms (administered as a group test) in another school district. This pilot investigation made it possible to refine some of the questions and develop the scoring procedure.

Administration in the study. The test was administered individually by the teacher to four children in her classroom. Two of them were the subjects with the lowest sociometric scores, one was a sociometrically average child selected at random, and the fourth was the most popular child in the classroom. The teachers were given no indication as to why these subjects were selected. Teachers were instructed to make the child feel at ease during the test. They were also asked to challenge each child so that the maximum performance could be obtained from them. No time limit was given for the test. Each child was tested on four of the six questions. The responses given by the children were written by the teacher.

Scoring procedure. Based on the work of Torrance (1962) and Wallach and Kogan (1965) on creative thinking, the children's responses were classified under three criteria: fluency, flexibility, and quality. The fluency score was for the total number of responses given regardless of their quality. The flexibility score was the number of different principles, approaches, or categories used in answering the question. The quality

score was given for the sensitivity to the problem, the degree of penetration in imagining the consequences, and the comprehension in taking into consideration all the details of the situation. (For a detailed description of the scoring see Appendix J.) Each child received three total scores, on fluency, flexibility, and quality, that were the sum of scores on all four questions. The tests were scored by two judges.

Lesson Activities and Evaluation Sheet

Teachers in the experimental group were asked to fill out an evaluation sheet after each role-playing session. The sheet was divided into two main parts. In part A, the teachers checked each of the steps and activities they followed during that particular session. In the second part, they evaluated on a short rating scale their students' involvement, interest, social relationships, and type of solutions they came up with during the session. The purpose of this sheet was to serve both as a guide (reminding the teacher of all the steps and activities that can be applied), and as an evaluation of his/her activities and their success.

Teacher Evaluation Form

At the end of the program, teachers in the experimental group filled out a questionnaire in which they were asked to evaluate the role playing study. Questions included an evaluation of the usefulness of the program for themselves; the impact of the program on their students; and an evaluation of the training manual and the materials. (See Appendix F.)

Design and Statistical Analyses

Design

The basic design that was used in the study was the "before and after control group design" (Kerlinger, 1964), also called the "pretest-posttest control group design" (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). This design takes the following form:[14]

[R]	O_1	X	O_2	Experimental
	O_3	(—X)	O_4	Control

Intact classrooms were randomly assigned (based on a table of random numbers to the experimental condition or to the control condition). Also, the experimental treatment (X) was randomly assigned to the experimental group..

Before the intervention started, the sociometric test and the Reputation Test were administered by teachers in all 65 classrooms. Teachers also rated the children in their classrooms on the Social Behaviors Rating Scale. Following the testing, a 10 week treatment period started in which role-playing sessions were implemented in the experimental

---

[14] The symbol [R] is used as an indicator for the random assignment of the subjects (classrooms) to the experimental or control groups and for the random assignment of the experimental treatment to the experimental group. The X represents the exposure of the experimental group to the experimental variable (the role playing). The symbol (—X) means that the experimental treatment is not presented to this group. The O's refer to the process of measurement. O_1 and O_3 refer to the measures of the dependent variables before the manipulation of X. While O_2 and O_4 refer to the measures of the dependent variables after the manipulation of X.

classrooms. During that time, teachers filled out the evaluation sheet after each role-playing session. At the termination of the program during the eleventh and twelveth week, teachers administered the post-tests in their classrooms. (See Appendix I for testing instructions). The testing included the Sociometric Test, the Reputation Test, and the Problem-Solving Test. Teachers again filled out the Social Behaviors Rating Scale. They also answered a questionnaire in order to get their general impressions of the program. (For a time table of testing see Table 42 in Appendix M.)

Analyses of the Data

Because the units which were randomly assigned the treatments in this study were intact classrooms, the logic of the situation demanded that the classroom mean scores rather than individual mean scores be used as the unit of statistical analyses (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Kerlinger, 1964; Lindquist, 1953; Peckham, Glass, & Hopkins, 1969).

Most of the data were analyzed by the analysis of covariance procedure. The Problem-Solving Test (administered as a posttest only) was analyzed by a one way analysis of variance. The 13 scores on the Reputation Test and the Self-Nomination Scale were analyzed by the multivariate analysis of covariance procedure.

The data were punched on IBM cards, and processed at Indiana University's Wrubal Computer Center, and at Ohio University's Clippinger Computer Center.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Implementation of the Program in the Classroom

Thiagarajan, Semmel, and Semmel (1974), have pointed out that it is important that some form of process evaluation take place during the summative evaluation[15] or validation testing in order to determine whether the treatment was implemented as intended. This phase of the validation testing has been called transfer validation, which "measures the extent to which a teacher's real-world performance is affected by the skill or knowledge he has acquired from the instructional material" (p. 148). Data on the program implementation were secured in this study by asking the teachers to fill-out a "Lesson Activities and Evaluation" checklist after each role-playing session.

Number of Role-Playing Sessions

As Table 2 shows, the median number of sessions was 13.4 (or 1.3 lessons per week) for the combined groups of 31 teachers over the 10 week period of intervention. Only two teachers used, on the average, less than one role-playing session per week. On the other hand, about one-third (10) of all teachers implemented, on the average, almost two sessions per week (i.e., between 16 to 20 sessions). Whereas the teachers were

---

[15] The summative evaluation is the "evaluation of instructional materials under specified conditions in order to report their effectiveness" (Thiagarajan, Semmel, and Semmel, 1974).

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Role-Playing Sessions in the Two School Districts

# of Sessions	District A	District B	Combined
20	1	0	1
19	1	1	2
18	0	2	2
17	2	1	3
16	0	2	2
15	0	2	2
14	2	1	3
13	1	4	5
12	2	3	5
11	2	2	4
10	0	0	0
9	0	1	1
8	0	1	1
Median	13.75	13.25	13.40

encouraged to implement the treatment twice a week, the data indicates that the actual number of sessions implemented per week fell short of expectation.

How Much Did Teachers Follow the Sequence of Role-Playing Steps?

The second question which might be asked about the implementation of the program is whether the teachers followed the recommended sequence of steps during each role-playing session. It had been pointed out to the teachers that although this sequence of steps had been found useful by many investigators, they were not required to follow the steps to the letter during each role-playing session. The extent to which teachers followed the sequence of steps is shown in Table 3.

All teachers (100%) in both school districts used the first seven steps out of the nine recommended to them in the workshop and in the training manual during many of the role playing sessions they implemented in their classrooms. These steps included: (1) warm-ups, (2) presentation of the problem story, (3) explanation of the situation, (4) explanation of the participant roles, (5) explanation of the audience roles, (6) the dramatic enactment, and (7) discussion. However, the last two steps of the sequence, #8 the "re-enactment" step, and #9 the "summary" step, were used by only 58% and 70% of the teachers respectively.

It can also be seen from Table 3 that several steps were used more often than others during the sessions. For example, (1) teachers tended to explain and set up the "geographic" and "climatic" situation for the roleplaying in about 75% of the sessions on the average. (2) The roles that the actors were expected to take during the dramatic enactment were

Table 3

Mean Percent of Teachers, and Mean Percent of Sessions in which the Role-Playing Steps and Techniques were Implemented

(Data for Combined Districts N=31)

STEP OR ACTIVITY	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions
Steps		
1. Warm-ups	100	48.0
2. Presentation of the Problem Story	100	53.1
3. Explanation of the Situation	100	75.3
4. Explaining Participant Roles	100	62.0
5. Explaining Audience Roles		
a. Audience Acted as Consultants	100	30.1
b. Audience listened and/or took notes	100	56.4
6. Dramatic Enactment:		
a. Pantomime	100	34.8
b. Role Play Story Ending	100	36.4
c. Acting from Seat	26.1	12.5
7. Discussion:		
a. Large group	100	73.4
b. Small group	83.9	20.7
c. Dyads	24.1	7.8
8. Re-enactment	57.8	17.8
9. Summary	69.8	54.6

TECHNIQUES AND ALTERNATIVES	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions
Techniques		
1. Role Reversal	63.4	14.7
2. Soliloquy Technique	30.3	10.8
3. Double Technique	30.7	10.1
4. The Consultant	83.9	20.4
5. Multiple Role Players	68.9	23.6
6. Multiple Enactment	83.4	19.2
7. The New Role	31.6	15.6
Alternatives		
A. Group Discussion		
a. Large group	78.4	23.1
b. Small group	36.2	13.6
c. Dyads	7.0	7.1
B. Auxiliary Chair	34.5	9.6
C. Writing Ending of Stories	71.7	12.9

outlined to them or explained by the teachers in about 62% of the sessions. (3) The audience roles were explained or outlined in about 86% of the sessions. It should be recalled that the audience or spectators could have taken two roles. They could have acted as consultants to the players, while at other times they could have taken the more passive role of watching and taking notes. (4) The dramatic enactment or the role-playing step was implemented in about 84% of the sessions. This step could have taken three forms: A pantomime of a short story in front of the class (used in 35% of the sessions), the roleplaying of the unfinished part of a longer problem story, again before the classroom (used in 36% of the sessions), and an enactment of roles from the student seats, which was the less recommended form (used only in 12% of the sessions). (5) The discussion step which followed the dramatic enactment was used in at least 73% of the sessions and probably up to about 90% or 100% (teacher reported using different discussion formats during the same session).

Two steps, the "Warm-Ups" and the "Presentation of the Problem," were implemented in only about 50% of the sessions. However, it should be recalled that the warm-up exercises were recommended for use mainly at the beginning of the program. Teachers were told that they could skip this stage later in the program. As to the "Presentation of the Problem," in many sessions short pantomimes were used where teachers were not expected to read or present the story to the class. Instead, several student volunteers enacted or "played" the pantomime in front of the class.

The last two steps, the "re-enactment" step and the "summary" step,

were not only used by about only two thirds of the teachers, but they were also used quite infrequently. The "re-enactment" step was used in only 18% of the total number of sessions, while the summary step was used in about 55% of the sessions. (This finding will be discussed in the next section.)

Experimentation with Alternatives

To what extent did the teachers actually use different role-playing techniques, alternative lesson formats, and suggested additional classroom activities? As can be seen from Table 3 under the section "Techniques," a teacher could have used seven different role-playing techniques. All teachers (see also Table 21 in Appendix A) tried several techniques during the whole program. The mean number of techniques tried was 3.9 (out of possible seven). It is interesting that no teacher tried all seven techniques.

A look at the figures in Table 3 reveals that some techniques seemed to be more "appealing" or more "comfortable" to the teacher and were used more often by them. Examples are "Role Reversal" (tried by 63%), "The Consultant" (tried by 84%), "Multiple Role Players" (tried by 69%), and "Multiple Enactments" (tried by 83%). Several other techniques seemed to be less attractive or interesting to the teachers and were tried by only about one-third of the teachers. Examples are "Soliloquy Technique" (tried by 30%), "Double Technique" (tried by 31%), and "The New Role" (tried by 32%). Very few differences in the use of different techniques were found between the teachers in the two school districts (see Table 21 in Appendix A). However, the "Role Reversal" technique

was used by many more teachers in District A than in District B. The figures are 82% and 45%, respectively. On the other hand, "The New Role" technique was used by many more teachers in District B than in District A. The figures are 45% in District B versus only 18% in District A.

Teachers also had several other choices in addition to those they had in the use of the different techniques. For example, they had a choice between several discussion formats and also between several alternative formats, which included modifications of some of the role-playing steps.

The three discussion formats from which a teacher could choose were (1) large group discussion, (2) small group discussion, and (3) discussion in pairs or dyads. As can be seen from Table 3, teachers tended to prefer the use of the "large group discussion" format, i.e., the traditional way teachers run discussions in their classrooms. All teachers used this format in 73% of the sessions. The second format, "small group discussion," was used by 84% of the teachers in only one-fifth (21%) of the sessions. The third format, "dyads," were tried by only 24% of the teachers in a very small number of sessions (8%).

Teachers could have made another choice between several alternative formats. For example, a group discussion without role enactment, the "auxiliary chair" format (which is actually another role-playing technique in which the teacher takes a leading and active role), and the writing of a story ending.

As to the discussion format, again it can be seen that more teachers

used the large group discussion format (78%) than the small group discussion format (36%), and the "dyads" format was tried by only 7% of the teachers.[16]

The two alternative formats, the "auxiliary chair" technique and the "writing of a story ending" were used quite infrequently by the teachers. The "auxiliary chair" was tried by 35% of the teachers in only 10% of the sessions, and the "writing of a story ending" was used by 72% of the teachers, but in only 13% of the sessions. However, in both cases it was the group of teachers in District B who "gave it a try" rather than the teachers in District A. This is particularly true for the "auxiliary chair" where only 1 teacher out of 11 tried it in District A (9%) while in District B, 12 teachers out of 20 (60%) tried it at least once.

Differences between the teachers in the two school districts can also be observed in the last two steps of the role-playing sequence, i.e., "Re-enactment" and "Summary." While 70% of the teachers in District B used the "Re-enactment" step in their classrooms, only 45% of the teachers in District A used this step. Also, the "Summary" step was used by 85% of the teachers in District B versus only 55% of teachers who used this step in District A.

---

[16] Several teachers sometimes checked a discussion format twice under the "Discussion" step (#7) and also under "Alternative Formats." Therefore the figures may exceed 100%. However, this does not change the general trends and differences discussed in this section.

Conclusions. From the findings presented in this section the following main conclusions can be made.

(1) In general, about 1.5 role-playing sessions per week were implemented in the experimental classrooms over a period of 10 weeks.

(2) Teachers tended to closely follow the sequence of role-playing steps outlined to them during the workshop and in the training manual. This was true in particular for steps 1 to 7.

(3) The number of times the different steps were implemented in the classroom ranged from a low of 18% to a high of 100% of the total number of sessions. Most steps were implemented, however, in about 60%-80% of the sessions.

(4) Teachers were quite "open" in trying different role-playing techniques recommended to them during the workshop and in the manual. Out of 7 techniques, teachers used, on the average, 3.9. Several techniques were found to be more appealing and were used more often by the teachers than other techniques. Examples are "Role Reversal," "The Consultant," and "Multiple Enactment," which were all used by many more teachers than the "Double" technique or the "Soliloquy" technique.

(5) Several noticeable differences were found between the teachers in the two school districts. It seems that these differences were particularly in the "extras" of the intervention.

Although the teachers in the experimental group in both school districts used or implemented the intervention as suggested and planned

for this study, the teachers in District B did more than the minimum required of them than the teachers in District A, who did the job as required, but without extras.

Teachers' Evaluation of the Project

At the end of the program, each of the 31 participating teachers answered a questionnaire in which he or she were asked to make a general evaluation or judgment of the total program. Questions included an evaluation of the workshop, the weekly consultant periods, the materials and the training manual, and an evaluation of the usefulness of the program for the teacher and for her students.

Table 4 is a summary of the teachers' answers to the questionnaire. The data presented include the answers given by all 31 teachers in the two school districts. A breakdown of the data for each district separately can be found in Table 22 in Appendix A.

Teacher Evaluations of the Program's Usefulness for Themselves (Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 in Table 4)

This part of the evaluation focuses on the effectiveness of the program to the extent that teachers felt they had learned and acquired new role-playing skills and abilities, and were ready to utilize these skills in their classrooms in the future.

Teachers' answers to the four questions, which were aimed at discovery of their evaluation of the program's usefulness for themselves, were very positive. Most of the teachers felt that the workshop at the beginning of the program had been useful and helpful for learning some new activities and techniques to be used in their classroom (see question 1).

Table 4

Teachers Evaluation of the (Program Percent Giving Each Response to Questions (N=31))

A. Usefulness of Program for Teachers

	Responses					
The Workshop	I knew most of the techniques before	To a certain degree	Helpful & useful	Very helpful & useful	Extremely helpful & useful	Total
1. Was the workshop useful & helpful?	3.2	22.6	22.6	35.5	16.1	(100.0)
The Weekly (Bi-weekly) Consultations	Could do without it	Were of little help	Were of some help	Were of great help	Were extremely helpful	
2. Were the consultation periods of help to you?	3.2	6.5	54.8	32.3	3.2	(100.1)
General usefulness for teachers	Did not benefit	Learned & benefited little	Learned & benefited some	Learned & benefited quite a lot	Learned & benefited a lot	
3. How much did you benefit from the program?	--	--	37.9	51.7	10.4	(100.0)[17]
Use of role-playing in the future	I don't think I will use it	May use it from time to time	May use it quite often	May use it a lot		
4. Do you think you will use roleplaying in your classroom next year?	--	35.5	41.9	22.6		(100.0)

[17] Two teachers pointed out that they thought the program was directed to their students and not to them. N = 29 for this group.

Table 4 (Cont.)

B. Manual and Materials						
The Manual	Of little help	Of some help	Of great help	Extremely helpful		Total
5. Was the manual helpful and useful?	--	6.5	35.5	58.0		(100.0)
The Stories	Uninteresting	Interesting to a degree	Interesting	Very interesting	Outstanding	
6. How would you rate the stories in the manual?	--	9.7	29.0	51.6	9.7	(100.0)
Usefulness of the materials	Very little	Little	Some	Quite a lot	A lot	
7. How useful were the other materials (pictures, name tags, etc.)?	6.5	6.5	35.5	41.9	9.7	(100.0)
C. Impact on the Students						
Motivation	Very little	Little	Some	Quite a lot	A lot	
8. How much have they been interested & involved?	--	--	9.7	61.3	29.0	(100.0)
Gains from the program	Not benefit at all	Benefited a little	Benefited Some	Benefited quite a lot	Benefited a lot	
9. How much did students benefit from program in learning social skills?	--	3.2	70.9	19.4	6.5	(100.0)

About 84% of the teachers' answers fall into the three categories of "Workshop was helpful," "Workshop was very helpful," and "Workshop was extremely helpful." Only one teacher out of 31 felt that she previously knew the role-playing activities and techniques.

Most of the teachers also felt that the weekly or bi-weekly consultation periods, which were aimed at giving them additional training, were a valuable experience (question 2). About 35% found these periods to be of "great help" to them, while more than half (54%) found them to be at least of some help. Only one teacher could "live" without these consultations.

A very positive attitude toward the program can be seen from the teachers' answers to the direct question (#3), "How much did you learn and benefit from the whole program?" Sixty-three percent of the teachers indicated that they had learned and benefited "quite a lot" and "a lot," while the remaining 37% indicated that they "learned and benefited some." No teacher said that she did not gain anything from the program.

The positive evaluation of the program can again be seen from the answers to question 4. Sixty-five percent of the teachers indicated that they plan to use the different role-playing activities and the materials next year "quite often" or even "a lot." No teacher indicated that she will not make any use in the future of her newly acquired role-playing skill.

While no large differences were found between the teachers' evaluations of the program in the two school districts, the teachers in District B expressed a more positive evaluation than did the teachers in District

A. (See Table 22 Appendix A.) For example, on question 1, more teachers in District B found the workshop to be "very helpful" or even "extremely helpful." The figures are 60% in District B versus only 36% in District A. Similarly, of the teachers in District B, 45% felt that the consultation periods were "of great help" or "extremely helpful" while only 18% of the teachers in District A gave this answer.

Evaluation of the Manual and the Materials (Questions 5, 6, and 7 in Table 4)

In this part of the questionnaire, teachers were asked to evaluate how usable or useful the training manual, the stories, and the additional materials were in helping and guiding them during the role-playing sessions. It can again be said that the teachers gave a very positive evaluation of the instructional materials prepared for the project. No sizable differences were noticed between the two school districts in teachers' evaluation of the manual and the materials.

A highly positive evaluation was given concerning the training manual. More than half of the teachers (58%) felt that the manual was "extremely helpful for them," and another 35% indicated that the manual was of "great help." Teachers also gave a very positive evaluation of the stories in the manual. Ten percent of the teachers felt that they were "outstanding," and more than half of the teachers (52%) found them to be "very interesting." Although the stories were adapted and modified for the specific purposes of the study, the full credit should be given to the authors or sources of the original stories. (See Appendix H.)

The materials (pictures, name tags, and briefings) were positively evaluated, but less so than the manual and the stories. Although 52% of the teachers found them to be useful "quite a lot" and "a lot," 35% found them to be only of "some help" and 13% of "little help "

From the teacher evaluation of the materials, it seems that they need further modification and improvement in order to insure their effectiveness in the future.

Impact of the Program on Students (Questions 8 and 9 in Table 4)

In this part of the questionnaire, teachers were asked two questions: (1) How interested and involved were their pupils in the program, and (2) how much did they benefit from it? As can be seen from question 8, the teachers felt that their students were very interested and motivated. More than 90% of the teachers indicated that the students were motivated "quite a lot" and "a lot," and no teacher felt that there was little interest on the side of her students.

On question 9, how much the teachers felt that their students benefited in learning social skills, only a "cautious" evaluation was expressed. Only 26% of the teachers felt that their students benefited "quite a lot," and "a lot." The majority of the teachers (71%) indicated that their students "benefited some." In other words, most of the teachers did not feel that their students made big gains.

Some small differences were found between the teachers' in the two districts evaluation of the program's impact on their students. More teachers in District B than in District A felt that their students benefited from the program. Thirty percent of the teachers in District

B as opposed to only 18% of the teachers in District A felt that their students benefited "quite a lot" and "a lot." (See question 9 in Table 22 in Appendix A.)

In summary, the teachers' evaluations of the total program, which included their judgment of the workshop, the consultation periods, the instructional materials, and the usefulness of the program for themselves as well as the involvement of the students , were very positive Some reservations were held about the magnitude of social skill gains for pupils.

Statistical Analyses of the Data Obtained from the Measurements of the Impact on the Children

This section will present the analysis of the data collected to measure the extent to which the program affected the children. Each hypothesis will be reviewed and considered in light of these results. The data for each dependent variable will be presented under a separate heading in tables generally depicting the pretest means, the posttest means, and the adjusted posttest means for the experimental and control groups in District A, District B, and of the combined districts.[18] In addition, the F ratio's and the significance levels obtained from the Analyses of Covariance will be given.[19] Additional data obtained from other tests (usually nonparametric) will be presented in the appendices. In all statistical analyses, $\alpha = .05$ was used as the level of significance.

Changes in the Social Status of the Unpopular Children

In this section, the impact of the role-playing program on the social status of the unpopular students will be examined.

The three indices used to measure the changes in social status were (1) the Choice Status Index (acceptance scores), (2) the Rejection Status

---

[18] The data for one experimental and one control classroom in District B were not included in most of the statistical analyses because of their small size. The total number of classrooms analyzed was therefore 63 out of 65. In very few instances N is smaller than 63 because of missing data.

[19] The problem-solving test was given only as a posttest. ANOVA procedure was used to analyze these results.

Index (rejection scores), and (3) the Net Status Index (choice status minus rejection status).

Choice Status (Acceptance Scores)

Hypothesis 1(a) stated that the low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score higher than those in the control group on the peer acceptance score following the role playing intervention.

The acceptance score was the mean percent of peers in a classroom who gave the four unpopular children in a positive choice.

Table 5 presents group means on the acceptance scores, and summarizes the analysis of covariance results comparing experimental and control groups on adjusted of posttest acceptance scores.[20] As Table 5 shows, the experimental group in District A, in District B, and in the combined districts, showed greater gains than did the control group on the acceptance score. The gains were the largest in District B where the experimental group gained as much as four times more than did the control group. However, none of these differences between the experimental and the control classrooms was statistically significant.

---

[20]As can be seen from the table, some initial differences on the pretest scores between the experimental and the control groups were found. These difference occurred although the groups were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions. Initial differences on the pretest were also noticed on certain other measures, and will be discussed in the Discussion chapter. These initial differences between groups were taken into account in the analysis of covariance procedure.

Table 5

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Acceptance Scores for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Means (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	7.19	8.43	7.88			
	Control N=11	5.83	6.68	7.23	1,19	0.182	NS
B	Experimental N=20	7.64	8.96	8.55			
	Control N=21	6.52	6.83	7.22	1,38	1.725	NS
Combined	Experimental N=31	7.48	8.77	8.33			
	Control N=32	6.28	6.78	7.20	1,60	1.821	NS

Rejection Status Index

The Rejection Status Index, or the rejection score, was the mean percent of rejection given to the four most unpopular pupils in each of the classrooms. Hypothesis 1(b) stated that the low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score lower than those in the control group on the peer rejection score following the role playing intervention. As in Table 6 indicates, no statistically significant differences between the experimental and the control groups were found for either the separate school districts, or for the combined districts.

In fact, Table 6 indicates that the control group in District A unexpectedly showed a much larger decrease in the mean rejection score than did the experimental group. The control group decreased 7.4% while the experimental group decreased only 3.75%.

Net Score Index

The Net Score Index is the score obtained from the algebraic summation of the choices and the rejections (acceptance score minus rejection score). Hypothesis 1(c) stated that low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score lower (more positively) than those in the control group on the acceptance minus rejection score (the net score) following the role playing intervention. No statistically significant differences were found between the two groups (see Table 7) for either school district separately, or for the combined districts.

Teacher Ratings

One of the purposes of the study was to change the teachers' perceptions of the unpopular children. Teachers rated all students in their

Table 6

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Rejection Scores for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Means (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	48.16	44.41	44.47			
	Control N-11	48.51	41.11	41.04	1,19	2.42	NS
B	Experimental N=20	49.52	44.06	43.93			
	Control N=21	48.99	44.86	44.98	1,38	.196	NS
Combined	Experimental N=31	49.04	44.18	44.14			
	Control N=32	48.83	43.60	43.62	1,60	0.089	NS

Table 7

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Net Scores for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Mean (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	40.97	35.98	36.24			
	Control N=11	42.67	34.43	34.17	1,19	0.568	NS
B	Experimental N=20	41.87	35.92	36.12			
	Control N=21	42.48	38.03	37.84	1,38	0.402	NS
Combined	Experimental N=31	41.50	35.95	36.23			
	Control N=32	42.55	36.80	36.52	1,60	0.021	NS

classrooms on eight favorable social characteristics, and on six socially unfavorable characteristics. The rating for each characteristic was on a five-point scale. A high rating on the positive scale indicated that the teacher perceived the child as exhibiting socially positive or desirable behaviors, while a low score indicates a more negative perception. On the negative scale, a high score indicates a negative perception by the teacher, while a low score indicates a positive evaluation.

Table 8 shows the ratings made by the teachers on the positive and negative scales, for pupils of different social status. As the figures in this table indicate, teachers rated the "unpopular," "average," and "stars" quite differently.[21] The low status pupils were rated the lowest in the classroom. They received the highest ratings on the negative behaviors, and the lowest ratings on the positive behaviors. On the other hand, the "stars" were rated very high. They received the lowest ratings on negative behaviors, and the highest ratings on the positive behaviors. The sociometrically average group fell in between the other two groups. They were rated more positively than the unpopular children, but less positively than the stars. The differences in the teachers ratings of the three groups were highly

---

[21]The "stars" in the study included two children in each classroom, who received the largest number of positive choices from their peers, and the lowest number of negative choices. They were selected on basis of their highest net scores. The "average" children were two pupils in each classroom randomly selected from the group of pupils whose scores on the net score fell in between the lowest group (the four most unpopular pupils) and the highest group (the two stars).

Table 8

Teacher Ratings (Means) of the most "Rejected," the "Average," and the "Stars" on the Positive and Negative Scales. (Combined experimental and control groups).

Status / Scale	Rejected	Average	Stars
Positive Scale	22.78	28.28	32.05
Negative Scale	17.30	15.16	13.80

significant for both the positive ratings ($F_{2,100} = 78.5$) and the negative ratings ($F_{2,100} = 18.5$). (See Appendix E, Table 35).

Teacher Ratings of the Unpopular Children Before and After Treatment

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be a difference in the way teachers perceive the unpopular children following treatment between the experimental and control groups. More specifically, teachers in the experimental group would rate the unpopular children more positively on the posttest as compared to the ratings of the control group.

Tables 9 and 10 summarize the findings of the teacher ratings of the low status children in the experimental and control groups on pre- and posttests. As Table 9 indicates, no significant differences were found on the teachers' ratings of the positive behaviors between the experimental and the control groups for either school district separately, or for the combined districts. Neither were any significant differences

Table 9

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on the Total Positive Score on the Teacher Rating Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Means (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	22.94	22.73	22.86	1,17	.0004	NS
	Control N=9	23.42	23.01	22.84			
B	Experimental N=19	22.64	22.77	22.60	1,33	.479	NS
	Control N=17	22.08	22.82	23.01			
Combined	Experimental N=30	22.74	22.75	22.70	1,53	.253	NS
	Control N=26	22.55	22.88	23.00			

Table 10

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on the Total Negative Score on the Teacher Rating Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Means (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	16.84	16.95	16.55	1,17	.031	NS
	Control N=9	15.77	15.50	16.38			
B	Experimental N=19	17.83	17.75	17.71	1,33	.040	NS
	Control N=17	17.67	17.57	17.63			
Combined	Experimental N=30	17.47	17.46	17.30	1,53	.101	NS
	Control N=26	17.02	16.99	17.17			

found on the teacher ratings of the negative behaviors (Table 10) between the two groups for either school district separately, or for the combined districts.

Thus, the hypothesis that the experimental group would be rated more favorably following the treatment than the control group on the teachers' positive and negative ratings cannot be supported on the basis of the findings.

Results from the "Reputation Test"

The Reputation Test, or the "Guess Who Test," used in this study yielded two sets of scores for the target population. The first set were the mean scores the unpopular children received as derived from the peer-nominations or descriptions of them. The second set of scores were the self-nomination or self-description mean scores of the four unpopular children themselves.

The Peer-Nomination Scale. The first set of scores which were derived from the "Guess Who" test were the peer-nominations, or descriptions of the unpopular children. The four subjects received 13 mean scores as well as a total score for the whole scale. Each of the 13 mean scores was derived by the algebraic summation of the votes a child received on a positive item and the votes he received on the negative item on each of the constituent pairs. Scores with negative signs indicated that more peers in the classroom tended to attribute a negative trait or characteristic to a child, while the contrary was true for a score with a positive sign. A score of 0 indicated that the same number of peers nominated the subject on the positive item as on the nega-

tive item on the same individual item pair, or that the peers have not nominated the child at all on that item pair.

The data from the Peer-Nomination Scale were analyzed by using a multivariate analysis of covariance for the 13 variables, and by a univariate analysis of covariance for each variable separately. (Because of the small number of classrooms in District A, it was impossible to perform a MANCOVA on all 13 variables together. Therefore, these variables were grouped into clusters of four or five variables each.[22]) In addition, the total score for the entire scale was analyzed using an ANCOVA.

Hypothesis 3(a) stated that low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score lower (less negatively) than those in the control group on the scores obtained from peer judgments on the Reputation Test following the roleplaying intervention.

As can be seen from Table 11, none of the multivariate analyses of covariance of the 13 variables for the combined districts, or for the two districts separately, was statistically significant.

The results from the univariate analyses of covariance were also insignificant (see Tables 29, 30, and 31 in Appendix D). In other words, none of the differences between the experimental and the control

[22]The clustering was based on the content similarity of the variables and their intercorrelations. No factor analysis was used to cluster the items.

Table 11

Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for 13 Variables of Peer Nomination Scale for District A, District B , and Combined Districts

District A Variables	F Ratio (4,13)	P
I. Popular, fair in games, full of fun, active in games.	0.76	NS
II. Not talkative, does not fight, not bashful, not a show off.	0.35	NS
III. Friendly, leader, not quarrelsome, not bossy, tidy.	1.29 (D.f 5,11)	NS

District B Variables	F Ratio (13,14)	P
All 13	1.74	NS

Combined Districts	F Ratio (13,36)	P
All 13	0.97	NS

groups on the 13 variables of the scale for the combined districts, or for the two districts separately, were statistically significant.

Analyses were also carried out on the total score of the Peer-Nomination Scale. As can be seen from Table 12, none of the F ratio's for these analyses were statistically significant. This was true for District A, District B, and the combined districts.

Thus hypothesis 3(a) was not supported. There was no significant post treatment difference between the experimental and the control group on the Peer-Nomination Scale.

The Self-Nomination Scale. On the Self-Nomination Scale, the four subjects received 13 scores as well as a total score for the whole scale. Each of the 13 scores was derived by the algebraic summation of a child's vote on both the positive and the negative characteristic (or item) of the constituent pair. The possible scores on each characteristic for a child could be +1 (indicating that the child nominated himself on the positive characteristic but not on the negative one), -1 (indicating that the child nominated himself on the negative characteristic but not on the positive one), and 0 (indicating that the child nominated himself on both or none of the characteristics).

The self-nomination scores were analyzed by using a multivariate analysis of covariance for all 13 traits, and by a univariate analysis of covariance for each variable separately. (In District A, because of the small number of classrooms, it was impossible to perform a MANCOVA on all 13 variables together. It was decided therefore, to group the

Table 12

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Total Score of Peer Nomination Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Means (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	-12.4	-12.3	-13.1	1,19	0.02	NS
	Control N=11	-15.3	-14.1	-13.3			
B	Experimental N=20	-15.2	-15.0	-14.5	1,38	2.80	NS
	Control N=21	-13.8	-12.1	-12.6			
Combined	Experimental N=31	-14.2	-14.0	-14.1	1,60	2.34	NS
	Control N=32	-14.3	-12.8	-12.8			

variables into clusters of four or five variables each.) In addition, the total scores was analyzed by using an analysis of covariance.

Hypothesis 3(b) stated that "low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score higher (more positively) than those in the control group on the scores obtained from their self nominations on the Reputation Test following the role playing intervention."

As can be seen from Table 13 , none of the multivariate analysis of covariance of the 13 variables for the combined districts or for the two districts separately was statistically significant. The univariate analyses of covariance are reported in Tables 32, 33, and 34 in Appendix D. Three univariate tests were significant: two variables "not quarrelsome" and "not bashful," favoring the experimental group as compared to the control group in District A, and one variable "popular" favoring the control group as compared to the experimental group in District B.

In addition to the use of multivariate analysis of covariance, the total score on the Self-Nomination Scale was analyzed by using an analysis of covariance. The results from this analysis are presented in Table 14. As the table indicates, no significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups on the total score in each of the school districts separately, or in the scores for the two districts combined.

Based on the results from the different analyses of the Self-Nomination Scale presented in this section, Hypothesis 3(b) , which stated that the experimental group will score higher than the control group

Table 13

Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for 13 Variables of Self-Nomination Scale For District A, District B and Combined Districts

District A Variables	F Ratio (D.f. 4,13)	P
I. Popular, fair in games, full of fun, active in games.	0.35	NS
II. Not talkative, does not fight, not bashful, not a show off.	2.82	.06
III. Friendly, leader, not quarrelsome, not bossy, tidy.	1.66 (D.f. 5,11)	NS

District B Variables	F Ratio (D.f. 13,14)	P
All 13	1.85	NS

Combined Districts Variables	F Ratio (D.f. 13,36)	P
All 13	1.87	.06

Table 14

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on Total Score on Self-Nomination Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Means (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	2.09	3.95	3.94	1,19	2.55	NS
	Control N=11	2.06	2.65	2.66			
B	Experimental N=20	1.62	2.30	1.98	1,38	0.13	NS
	Control N=21	0.60	1.89	2.18			
Combined	Experimental N=31	1.79	2.88	2.66	1,60	0.39	NS
	Control N=32	1.10	2.15	2.37			

on the post treatment self nomination measures, was not supported.

Results from the Social Problem-Solving Test

In this section, the results from the Problem-Solving Test administered as a posttest only to the experimental and control groups will be presented. It should be recalled that the test was administered by the classroom teacher as an individual test to form children in the classroom. Each test was then scored independently by two judges who classified the answers given by a child on each of the four questions utilizing three criteria: (1) fluency; (2) flexibility; and (3) quality. The inter-judge reliability was assessed by calculating the average agreement (simple percentage agreement) on each of the three criteria for the two, and by calculating the correlations between them on the three criteria.

Table 15 summarizes these two analyses.

Table 15

Average agreement and correlation co-efficients between the two judges on fluency, flexibility, and quality.

(Number of Tests = 240)

Criteria	Average Agreement	Correlation Coefficient
Fluency	.973	.987
Flexibility	.818	.827
Quality	.910	.727

Table 15 shows that the mean, or average percent of agreement between the judges over the 240 tests (which each judge scored) is extremely high. It is almost perfect for the fluency category, which is self-explanatory. The task of the judge was to count the number of different answers given by each child to the four questions. The teachers did not number the answers given by the children, but wrote them down in several paragraphs.

The average agreement for flexibility and quality is also very high. Similar comments can be made in regard to the correlations found between the two judges. All three correlations are highly significant ($P < .0001$). The lowest correlation of .727 on the quality category, points toward the more difficult task of scoring on this criteria than on the other two. As already indicated, the decision to choose the three criteria (fluency, flexibility, and quality) into which children's answers were classified, is based on the work of Torrance (1962) and Wallach and Kogan (1965). It is interesting to note that these three criteria do seem to measure different aspects of the problem-solving ability. As Table 16 notes, a high correlation was found only between fluency and flexibility, indicating that these two criteria measure similar aspects. This does seem reasonable in the sense that as a child is giving more answers, his answers can then also be divided into more possible different categories or approaches. On the other hand, the correlation between fluency and quality, and between flexibility and quality were much lower. The correlation of .40 between fluency and quality can explain only 16% of the variance between the two, while the correlation between flexibility

and quality of .50 explains only 25% of the variance between the two.

Table 16

Intercorrelations Between Fluency, Flexibility, and Quality.

	Flexibility	Quality
Fluency	.851	.397
Flexibility	--	.497

Problem-Solving in the Experimental and Control Groups

Hypothesis 4 stated that low sociometric status children in the experimental group will score higher than those in the control group on the social problem-solving test scores following the roleplaying intervention. Table 17 is a summary of the one way analysis of variance on the Problem-Solving Test.

The table shows that no statistically significant differences were found between the experimental and the control groups on the Problem-Solving Test for any of the three criteria of fluency, flexibility, or quality. This statement holds true for the findings in the two districts separately and for the data for the combined districts.

In one further analysis, the performance of the "unpopular," the "average," and the "stars" on the Problem-Solving Test were compared in order to test whether or not the test discriminates between the three groups.

Table 17

Group Means and Analysis of Variance Results on Fluency, Flexibility, and Quality Criteria on Problem-Solving Test for District A, District B,[23] and Combined Districts

District	Group	Index	Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	Fluency	13.47	1,20	.622	NS
	Control N=11		15.02			
	Experimental	Flexibility	10.61	1,20	.640	NS
	Control		11.54			
	Experimental	Quality	11.05	1,20	.185	NS
	Control		11.30			
B	Experimental N=21	Fluency	12.96	1,39	2.27	<.13
	Control N=20		10.90			NS
	Experimental	Flexibility	10.75	1,39	2.65	<.11
	Control		9.23			NS
	Experimental	Quality	11.45	1,39	.913	NS
	Control		11.02			
Combined	Experimental N=32	Fluency	13.14	1.61	.449	NS
	Control N=31		12.36			
	Experimental	Flexibility	10.70	1.61	.762	NS
	Control		10.05			
	Experimental	Quality	11.31	1.61	.299	NS
	Control		11.11			

[23]The data from two classrooms, which had less than 15 students each (one experimental and one control) were included in this analysis. The N for the experimental group is therefore 21. The N for the control group is only 20 because of missing data.

Table 18

Means on Problem-Solving Test for Unpopular, Average and Most Popular Children. (For Both Districts Combined, and for Experimental and Control Groups Combined.)[24]

Criteria Group	Unpopular	Average	Popular	F	P
Fluency	12.72	13.37	13.72	0.76	NS
Flexibility	10.36	11.02	11.30	1.42	NS
Quality	11.21	11.52	11.80	2.62	<.10

As Table 18 shows, the mean scores for the three sociometric groups on each of the three criteria were somewhat different. However, the differences were very small and therefore insignificant. Only on the quality criteria did the difference reach the 10% level (Table 39, Appendix E). The breakdown of the data for the two school districts separately (Tables 37, 38, and 40 in Appendix E) also failed to reveal a significant difference between the three sociometric groups.

In summary, the Problem-Solving Test was found to have only a very limited power for discriminating between sociometrically different groups.

Changes in the Distribution of the Sociometric Choices--A Post Hoc Analysis

The major purpose of the study was to design an intervention program which would improve the social status of unpopular children in their class-

[24] No significant differences were found between experimental and control groups on the three criteria. (See ANOVA Tables 37, 38, and 39 in Appendix E.)

rooms. Therefore, the hypotheses of the study, and the related statistical analyses, focused on the rejected children rather than on the social structure of the classroom.

However, after these basic analyses were completed, it was decided to examine the distribution of the sociometric choices for the classroom groups as a whole. Rough examination of the distribution of the choices for all subjects suggested that the number of children in the experimental classrooms who fell in the highly accepted group increased between pre- and posttests. Thus, these scores were subjected to further analysis. As was noted in an earlier chapter, research studies in the area of sociometry differed widely in their approaches for choosing the most rejected and the most accepted students in a classroom. Actually, all of these choices were quite arbitrarily made. In this study, a decision was made to include in the group of the "highly accepted" or the "over-chosen" those pupils which were accepted by at least 20% of their peers on the net score. A net score of +20% and more might be found when a child is accepted by more than one-fifth of his peers and neglected by none of them, or, when a child is rejected by several students, but at the same time is accepted by many more in his classroom so that his net score (acceptance minus rejection) will yield an excess of at least one-fifth positive choices.

As can be seen from Table 19, some noticeable differences were found between the experimental and the control groups favoring the experimental pupils on the percent of "highly accepted" pupils. The findings for the two school districts separately failed, however, to approach statistical

Table 19

Group Means and Analysis of Covariance Results on the Percent of all Pupils in the Highly Accepted Category[25] for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

		Mean (Percent)			F Tests Comparing Experimental and Control Conditions		
District	Group	Pretest	Posttest	Adjusted Posttest	D.F.	F Ratio	Significance
A	Experimental N=11	15.52	18.72	19.07			
	Control N=11	18.10	15.45	15.10	1,19	2.19	NS
B	Experimental N=20	16.19	20.01	20.20			
	Control N=21	16.86	17.91	17.73	1,38	1.12	NS
Combined	Experimental N=31	15.95	19.55	19.88			
	Control N=32	17.29	17.06	16.75	1,60	3.09	<.10

[25] Highly accepted = accepted by 20% and more of the peers on net score.

significance. The ANOVA for the combined districts yeilded an F ratio of 3.09 which also fails to reach statistical significance ($.05 < P < .10$). (Since the analysis was a post hoc one based on preliminary scanning of the data, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.)

CHAPTER V

Discussion

The major purpose of this study was to test the usefulness of the roleplaying technique as a method for helping unpopular children gain social acceptance by their peers. Other related objectives were to test changes in teacher's and peer perceptions of the unpopular children as well as changes in the target children's self-perception. In addition, it was assumed that this type of treatment might have an impact in increasing the social problem-solving ability of the children that participated in the program.

The Implementation of the Role-Playing Program

Although the ultimate criterion of the effectiveness of the role-playing treatment was the impact it had on the children, a crucial "intervening variable" in bringing about the expected changes was the actual implementation of the role-playing activities in the classroom by the teachers.

Teachers' actual performance in the classroom was measured by a self-report checklist completed by the teachers on the Lesson Activities and Evaluation List (see Appendix F). The data obtained from the teachers' checklists during the implementation of the program was encouraging. While a few teachers implemented less than one role-playing session on the average per week, the majority of the teachers averaged about 1.5 sessions per week. This was somewhat short of the two sessions per week planned at the beginning of the study. However, in only a very few instances was the reason related to the teacher's inability to

implement the program.

Another finding which demonstrates that teachers used the role-playing activities quite closely to the way it was outlined to them was their tendency to follow the sequence of seven to nine role-playing steps suggested to them.

In addition to the checklist, the teachers also answered a questionnaire at the end of the study which was designed to get their opinions and evaluative comments about the program. Most of the teachers were extremely satisfied and felt that the workshop had been very helpful, an indication that it was a new learning experience and not a repetition of previous knowledge. It is also interesting that many of the teachers felt they would utilize the new skills and techniques they had acquired in the future. Through their answers to the questionnaire and comments made during the weekly consultation periods, the teachers highly praised the training manual and the role-playing stories. As one teacher put it, "It was really helpful to have these good materials and not worry about searching or preparing them."

The positive evaluation of the program by most of the teachers who participated is very encouraging in light of comments made in the literature that teachers seem to be quite hesitant and reluctant to use role-playing in their classrooms (Chesler & Fox, 1966; Grambs, 1968; Riessman, 1964) because they are insufficiently trained in the use of the technique, and because they associate the technique with psychotherapy. Evidently the role-playing techniques and activities taught during the workshop, the guidance offered during the consultation periods, and the teacher

training manual provided to them helped avoid problems reported in the literature. Differences in implementation and evaluation of the program were noticed between the two school districts. First, it was noticed that more teachers in District B than in District A tended to follow the whole sequence of role-playing steps. Another noticeable difference between the teachers in the two school districts was the greater willingness and readiness of the teachers in District B to try the more unusual formats and activities. Also, the teachers in District B judged the program as being more useful and beneficial for themselves than did the teachers in District A.

A possible explanation for the above differences between the teachers in the two school districts might be attributed to possible differences in the educational philosophy between the two districts. District A had not yet started to implement an affective education program, while District B had been exposed to a variety of affective education strategies. For example, many teachers and principals had read Glasser's book Schools Without Failure, (1969), and had participated in workshops directed by one of Glasser's assistants. Buscaglia's views had also been brought to the attention of the principals and the teachers by one of his books, Love (1972), and the workshop he gave in the district. In addition, two new open schools were initiated in the district in the last few years. It seems therefore, that the teachers in District B had already been convinced of the importance of providing an affective program for the children, and were therefore ready and willing to implement such a program.

Nevertheless, it should be indicated that although the program seemed to be new to the teachers in District A, they were interested in it and implemented the program in their classrooms as suggested.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, it seems that the findings support the assumption that the teachers in the study (1) acquired the basic knowledge and skills of roleplaying, and (2) used these skills and knowledge in applying roleplaying in their classrooms.

The Impact of the Program on the Social Status of the Rejected Children

The central hypothesis of the study was that the use of the role-playing technique in the classroom is an effective educational intervention for changing the social status of socially rejected students. The three measures which were used as indices of child's social status in the classroom were (1) the acceptance status, (2) the rejection status, and (3) the net score (acceptance minus rejection).

The target population in this study, i.e., the four most unpopular children in each classroom, were selected on the basis of their extremely high negative net scores on the pretest. These children were accepted by only a very few peers and rejected by many.

It was noticed that, on several measures, including the acceptance score, there were some differences between the experimental and the control group on the pretest. It is very difficult to explain these unexpected differences, particularly in light of the random assignment of the classrooms to the two experimental conditions. On several other measures, no such initial differences between the two groups were identified. Chance might be a possible explanation for the differences

found between the groups on the pretest. An alternative explanation might be that the teachers who previously knew which group they were to be assigned had some influence on their students during the pretesting. However one would expect teacher ratings to be most influenced by this factor, but teachers in the two groups did not rate their pupils differently on the pretest.

As already mentioned, there were some differences between the two school districts in the manner that teachers used the roleplaying techniques. The data were therefore also analyzed separately for each district.

The results from the analyses of the data from the sociometric test revealed that no statistically significant differences between the experimental and the control groups were found on any of the three indices (acceptance scores, rejection scores, and net scores). However, some interesting trends were noticed, some of which differentiated the two school districts. On the acceptance score, the experimental group (in the combined districts) gained more following treatment than did the control group. The difference in gains was even more marked in District B. Not only did the experimental group gain about four times more in acceptance as did the control group, but also twice as many experimental classrooms as control classrooms showed an increase in the mean acceptance score following treatment, while twice as many control classrooms as experimental classrooms remained unchanged or even decreased in social acceptance on the posttest (Table 23 Appendix B).

The findings from the analysis of the second index of social status, the rejection score, had some inherent difficulties or problems. The first problem is related to the ethical or moral issue, i.e., how justified is it to use negative questions in a sociometric test? While objections have been raised, several authors noted that for research purposes it is an important measure (Gronlund, 1959; Moore, 1967). The use of negative criteria or questions in this study made it possible to identify in each classroom a small group of children who were extremely rejected by their peers. (Had only positive criteria been used, it would not have been possible to differentiate between the isolated children and the rejected.)

Whereas the target population for the study was selected on basis of their extremely high rejection scores on the pretest, one might expect, as a function of the regression effect, that their high scores would tend to drop rather than gain on the retesting. On the other hand, a high degree of stability of negative choices has been reported in the literature (Gronlund, 1959; Jennings, 1950).

It is interesting to note that the findings from the analyses of the rejection scores in this study seem to support both positions. Both groups, experimental and control alike, dropped 4%-7% in their rejection scores on the posttest which might be explained as a regression effect. On the other hand, about two-thirds of the low group children remained in the same low sociometric category on the posttest.

Basically, the statistical analysis of the rejection score indicated that no significant differences were found between the experimental and

the control groups on that variable for either school district separately, or for the combined districts. However, while on the acceptance score trends were found in the predicted direction, the data on the rejection score shows the opposite trend, particularly in District A, where the control group unexpectedly showed a larger decrease in the rejection score than the experimental group.

One explanation for the large unexpected decrease in the rejection score shown by the control group (and the fact that they also out performed both groups in District B) might possibly be the impact of a "John Henry Effect" (Saretsky, 1972). According to Saretsky, "The John Henry effect is used to describe the above average performance by a control group placed in competition with an experimental group using an innovative procedure which threatens to replace the 'control' procedure" (p. 579). This unusually good performance by the control group as compared to the experimental group also occurred on the Problem-Solving Test.

The explanation which indicated a possible "John Henry Effect" is quite plausible, particularly in light of several initial difficulties in the program's implementation in District A. Since the treatment was initially introduced to teachers following another brief presentation on affective education, which had many practical problems, it might have been that the teachers in the control groups during this program (which started very soon after that unsuccessful presentation) tried to prove that they didn't need any training in "new ideas" and that they knew how to do the job. It is possible that they started to give some special attention to socialization activities in their classrooms which may

have led to the reductions in the rejection score.

The analyses of the rejection score in District B is more in line with what was predicted, and with the findings from other analyses. Although again both groups, experimental and control alike, decreased on the rejection score (a possible regression effect), the decrease was somewhat larger for the experimental group. However, the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant.

The discussion of the data from the analysis of the rejection score does seem to leave some question about the usefulness of this index in sociometric studies. The ethical or moral question of using negative questions with children (because of a possible negative impact on them) cannot be resolved in this paper, but should not be removed from the agenda in studies and publications utilizing sociometric data.

As the findings from this study indicated, subjects with extremely high negative status scores tend to show a downward shift on the Rejection Choice Index upon retesting. The figures indicated that in about 70%-80% of the classrooms, the mean rejection score decreased on the posttest (see Table 28 Appendix C). Because the rejection choice scores do seem to show shifts on a retest even without a treatment, any intervention program which seems to have only a moderate effect would not show its impact as much on that index.

Another way of looking at the rejection index and the impact that an intervention program might have on it, is to regard the acceptance index and the rejection index as measuring different aspects of social status. Hartup, Glazer, and Charlesworth (1967), for example, noted

that acceptance and rejection scores were not significantly correlated, and they seem to represent different parameters of social status. They go on to say that the predictions of these two dimensions of social behavior would be expected to differ. Hartup (1970), in his review of the literature, noted that there is ample evidence to suggest that acceptance-rejection is not a unidimensional characteristic of peer interaction. More work is needed before more finalized conclusions can be drawn. It is possible that an intervention program such as roleplaying might have an impact on the social position as measured by the social acceptance index, while another type of intervention might have an impact on a child's social rejection index.

While the question of whether the two indices measure distinct parameters of social status is still open, a third index of social status, the Popularity Status Index or the choice minus rejection status score,[26] has been reviewed (Lindzey & Byrne, 1968; Proctor & Loomis, 1951) and widely used in sociometric studies (e.g., Dion & Berschied, 1974; Grossman & Wrighter, 1948; Hartup, Glazer & Charlesworth, 1967; McKinney, 1948; Moore, 1967). In this study, the most unpopular children were selected based on their extremely high negative net scores. This selection was therefore influenced by the rejection index more than by the acceptance index. As the figures indicated, these four children in each classroom

---

[26] In this study this index is referred to as the "net score."

were rejected on the average by about 48%-49% of their peers, but accepted by only 6%-8%. Therefore, their net scores on the average ranged from 40%-43%.

None of the statistical analyses of this variable for either school district or for the combined districts were statistically significant. As the figures demonstrated both the experimental and control groups showed a decrease on that score. This might have been expected again because the subjects were selected on basis of their extreme negative net scores (regression effect). It should be emphasized that the fluctuations or decrease of the rejection scores had a much greater impact on the changes noticed in the net score than the small increases which were noticed on the acceptance scores. To reiterate, it seems that the nonsignificant differences between the experimental and the control groups in the net score might be explained by the relatively large decreases of about 4%-7% which both groups had on the rejection scores. The increase of about 1%-2% on the acceptance scores shown by the experimental groups as opposed to the much smaller increase by the control groups was too small to have any real impact on the net score. One might speculate that if the intervention program had been more potent, with much more impact on the acceptance score, it would also have been shown on the net score and possibly on the rejection score. It is interesting to note that in Table 20 the net score in this study was found to have a relatively high degree of stability. As seen in Table 20 the stability of the net score for the low status group over a ten week period was 62%-64%. This figure is in accordance with findings

Table 20

Stability (Percent) of Pupils in the Low Status Group Who Remained in the Same Sociometric Category on the Posttest (on Net Score)

District	Group	Changed Position	Remained in the Same Category	Total
A	Exp.	27%	73%	100%
	Cont.	36%	64%	100%
B	Exp.	41%	59%	100%
	Cont.	39%	61%	100%
Combined	Exp.	36%	64%	100%
	Cont.	38%	62%	100%

from several research studies (at the elementary school level) which have been concerned with the stability of sociometric results (see Gronlund, 1959).

In summarizing the discussion on the results from the three indices of the social status, the Social Acceptance Index was the only measure which seemed sensitive to the treatment. Even on the acceptance measure the impact of the role-playing program on the social position of the unpopular children in this study was suggested, though not demonstrated, in District B, and not shown at all in District A.

These results are quite congruent with the results reported in the literature from studies which used the same or a very similar intervention program. For example, Souerwine and Conway (1953) used role-playing to improve the social interaction of a small group of sixth grade boys as measured by the mean social status and the number of choices given. Their results were in the expected direction, but not statistically significant. Long (1957) used carefully designed role-playing sessions intended to "teach the children to understand the social behavior of others and to use multiple solutions in solving social problems." He hypothesized that children who grow at a rapid rate, at a high level, and in a unified pattern will show more improvement in integrating these new experiences than children who grow at a slow rate, at a low level, and in a split pattern. The results, as measured by sociometric ratings, were not statistically significant. However, on the nonparametric sign test, he found a relationship between expertness and the four growth measures grouped together.

Play therapy is another type of intervention which has several similar elements as role playing, and was used to change the social status of unpopular children in a number of investigations. For example, Cox (1953) used play therapy based on the principles of Axline (1947) with a group of children in an Australian orphanage. The sociometric test was used in the study as an indicator of adjustment. He found significant differences between the experimental and the control group following treatment, as well as on a retest 14 weeks later. However, when the data were analyzed separately for the three age groups, the sociometric test revealed a significant change only in the eldest group.

Fleming and Synder (1947) used play therapy and found that the experimental group had a significantly higher acceptance score following treatment than did the control group. However, no impact was found on the rejection score. Also, the impact was found only for girls and not for boys, for whom a decrease on the acceptance score was noticed.

In assembling the findings from research which used a role-playing intervention or play therapy to change the social status of unpopular children, there is only limited evidence to show that this type of intervention has impact on the social status of the socially rejected child. One possible explanation of these findings is that individuals who are so widely rejected and poorly accepted have become so because of multiple and/or highly salient personal characteristics which are particularly invulnerable to role-playing (or play therapy) treatments.

In this study, very rarely was a student identified as being an "isolate" in the original meaning of the term, "an individual who receives

no choices" (Gronlund, 1959). In other words, since the sociometric test in this investigation included both positive and negative sociometric choices which students were "forced" to make, in none of the 65 classrooms did a student receive no choices at all. However, a few students in several classrooms were chosen only by one or two of their peers, and at the same time were rejected by another one or two. It is possible that these children are isolates, or neglectees. Gronlund (1959) suggested that a neglectee is an individual who receives "relatively few choices on the sociometric test." However, the criteria for "few choices" are unclear. For example, Gronlund and Anderson (1957) identified those subjects which were accepted by four and rejected by two as neglected. On the other hand, Hartshorn and Brantley (1973) used the term isolates for those subjects who were in the lowest quartile in terms of the total number of times chosen, in response to the questions "who don't you like" and "who are your friends." Due to this lack of clarity of definitions of terms particularly when positive and negative choices are used in a test, it was decided that this study should focus only on the group of rejected children, and not on the isolated or neglected pupils who not only were few, but probably could not be identified without using some very rough criteria.

A final point about one outcome of the sociometric measure in this study is worth mentioning. As recalled from Table 6 in the Results Chapter, the four most unpopular children in each classroom selected as the target population were, on the average, rejected by about 50% of their peers (15 children in a classroom of 30). These children (see

Table 5) were accepted by only 6%-7% of their peers (about two children). Following treatment, the subjects were still rejected by 44% of their peers, i.e., by about 13 children in a classroom of 30. They were accepted by 7%-9% of the peers (in the experimental group in District B for example) which amounts to only 2.7 children.

There is no question that an urgent need exists for a continued effort to develop and test materials, methods, and procedures to help these children gain greater social acceptance. Particularly since more and more school districts are starting to "mainstream," now is the right time for renewed thinking and action in that area.

The Impact of the Program on Teacher Perceptions

Teacher perception of a child is considered to be a powerful factor in influencing the type and scope of interaction between the two, and on other related variables such as the child's behavior. The literature is critical about the findings by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), who reported that teacher expectancy had influenced the intellectual growth of the so called "late bloomers" (Thorndike, 1968). However, several investigations have demonstrated that there are conditions under which teacher's expectancy is related to the child's behavior and achievement (e.g., Beez, 1968, Brophy & Good, 1970).

In relating teacher perception to acceptance, Gronlund (1959) noted that individuals who are highly selected on a sociometric test tend to be rated higher by the teacher on socially desirable behaviors, or characteristics, while the isolated and rejected students have generally been characterized by their teachers as possessing socially undesirable behaviors

or characteristics and exhibiting adjustment difficulties in the social sphere.

Several other scholars, Croft and Grygier (1956), Sears (1963), and Semler (1960) for example also noted the high agreement between peer acceptance measures and teacher ratings. If teachers and peers do seem to agree about whether they like or dislike certain pupils, one may speculate that the teacher might have some impact on the social patterns or social relationships in the classroom. This was demonstrated in a study by Flanders and Havumaki (1963) who found that teacher-pupil interaction involving direct praise increased the choice value of the reinforced students who were accepted more by their peers. Similar findings were also reported by Retish (1963).

This study hypothesized that, following treatment, the experimental teachers would perceive the "four most unpopular children" more favorably than on the pretest. One might assume that the teachers' perception of the social behaviors of the target population might change concomitant with actual changes in their behavior and possible changes in their social status. On the other hand, one might speculate that very slight changes in pupil behavior might occur without any change in peer status while the teacher, nevertheless, changes her perception.

Teacher perceptions of the children were collected from two different instruments used in this study. The first was a questionnaire in which the teachers were asked to evaluate the total program, including an evaluation of the impact of the program on student behaviors. The second instrument was a rating scale on which the teacher rated every child in the

classroom on eight socially desirable behaviors and six socially undesirable behaviors.

On the questionnaire administered at the end of the program, teachers indicated that their students were highly involved and motivated during the program. However, they did not report perceiving any significant changes in student behaviors.

The statistical analysis of the data from the Teacher Rating Scale indicated that there were no significant differences in teacher perceptions of both the positive and the negative social behaviors of the experimental group subjects as compared to the perceptions of the control group subjects' teachers. Both groups of children, experimental and control, were judged in a very similar manner by their teachers on the pretest. On the posttest ten weeks later, teachers' mean ratings of the children in both groups were almost identical to their ratings on the pretest.

The fact that teachers in the experimental group did not change their perceptions about the low status students is not surprising in light of the insignificant changes which were noticed in the social status of these students. It is also in accordance with the peer-perceptions of the unpopular student, which will be discussed later in this section.

It is interesting to note that the teachers not only did not change their perception or judgment of the sociometrically low status students, but they also did not change their perception for the "average" child and the "star" in their classrooms (see Tables 35, 36, Appendix E). One of

the related outcomes from this analysis was the finding that teachers rated the sociometrically low, the average, and the most popular child in their classes differently. The statistical analysis indicated a significant difference in the teachers' rating for these three groups of children. The "stars" were rated the highest on socially desirable behaviors, and the lowest on socially undesirable behaviors. The next group, in order, were the average children, and the last were the low status children who were rated the lowest on the socially desirable behaviors and the highest on the socially undesirable behaviors. (It should be recalled that no information about the social position of these three groups was given to the teachers.) This finding agrees with earlier research findings which indicated a relationship between teacher judgment and social status (Gronlund, 1959; Croft & Grygier, 1956; Roff, 1960; Sears, 1963; Semler, 1960).

This study's finding that teachers did not change their perceptions of the low status students following the role-playing program does seem to be supported in the literature. For example, Seeman, Barry, and Ellinwood (1956) used play therapy with children, but could not find changes in the teacher ratings. Similarly, Retish (1968) found changes in the social status of low status students to be a result of teacher positive reinforcement, but did not find changes in teacher perception of the children. It seems that the interval between the two judgments in this study was quite short (10 weeks) to produce a real change in perception. In addition, teachers rated the children after the beginning of the second semester, a time when they had already established a quite "clear" picture of the students. It has also been

previously indicated that only relatively small changes occurred in the low status children during that period, and that most of them maintained the same social position at the end of the 10 weeks. It might therefore be concluded that teachers were quite consistent (and accurate) in their ratings of the social behaviors of the low status children.

The Impact of the Program on Peer- and Self-Perceptions on the Reputation Test

The Reputation Test was used as a measure of peer attitudes toward the unpopular children and as a measure of the self-evaluations, or self-judgments, of these children. It was hypothesized that the treatment would have a positive effect both in changing the peer-perceptions of the unpopular children and in changing the self-perceptions of these children in the positive direction.

As the data from the peer-nominations indicated, the four most unpopular children in each classroom were perceived quite negatively by their peers. Fifteen percent to twenty-five percent of the peers (after subtracting the positive nominations from the negative nominations on an item pair[27]) nominated the unpopular children as being "unfriendly," "not popular," "not a leader," "quarrelsome," "not tidy," and "unfair in games." Other characteristics which were mentioned by 10%-14% of the peers were "fights," "talkative," "bossy," "show off," "not full of fun," and "not active in games."

---

[27] Actually, the percent of children perceiving the unpopular children negatively was much higher. As the raw data indicated, the percentages were quite often in the 30's and 40's.

Following treatment, not too many changes in peer-perception were found. As indicated by the results, no significant differences between the experimental and the control group were found on either the total score of the scale or the 13 separate variables. The unpopular children in the experimental group, and in the control group, were perceived very similarly on the posttest and on the pretest. However, there was some indication of a slightly more positive judgment of the unpopular children by their peers in the control group than in the experimental group, particularly in District B.

One possible explanation might be that the role-playing program increased the awareness of the pupils to social behaviors which are disruptive to peer interaction, and therefore they "attended" more to some of these behaviors exhibited by the unpopular children. As a result, even in the case of a small reduction in the negative behaviors, their larger saliency would have prevented peers from seeing a change. Seeman and Edwards (1954) reported a relatively large decrement in the adjustment scores of their experimental group subjects (more maladjustment) on the "Rogers Personality Test" following a nondirective general therapeutic treatment used by teachers in the classroom.

On the second set of scores of the Reputation Test, the self-evaluations of the unpopular children revealed no significant differences between the experimental and the control groups on adjusted posttest scores. However, in District A, a higher increase (in the positive direction) was noticed on 10 out of the 13 variables of the self nomination scale in the experimental group as compared to the control group.

The difference on two variables reached statistical significance. In addition, a post hoc analysis (Fisher Test) revealed that a significantly larger number of experimental classrooms (10/11) than control classrooms (5/11) increased in positive self perceptions (Table 27, Appendix B). In District B, on the other hand, almost no differences were found between the two groups.

A possible explanation for the differences found in District A might be traced to the novelty or newness of the program. As previously indicated, District A is quite a traditional school district, and the ideas of affective education have only very slowly penetrated the classrooms. The fact that the program emphasized free expression of thoughts and feelings, an acceptable and non-judgmental environment, discussions of children's behavior and feelings, and a change in the role of the teachers who participated quite actively in the roleplaying, might have produced more positive self-evaluations or more positive feelings in the low status children.

It should be reiterated that the positive increase in the self-perceptions of the experimental subjects did not coincide with the peer-perceptions which were shown to remain almost the same between pre- and posttests. This finding is not as discouraging as it might appear. Tuddenham (1952) for example, reported only low correlations between scores on self-judgment and classmates' judgments on the reputation test, and concluded that the agreement was actually quite poor.

The Impact of the Program on the Performance on the Social Problem-Solving Test

The Problem-Solving Test was developed for this study in order to

test whether the intervention had any impact on problem-solving ability in social situations for the children who participated in the role-playing program. The idea for testing changes in problem-solving ability was based on comments made in the literature that roleplaying is a method for enhancing this skill (Chesler & Fox, 1966; Klein, 1956; Shaftel & Shaftel, 1967), and on the basis of empirical research which demonstrated that roleplaying enhanced problem-solving ability (Hartshorn & Brantley, 1973). In addition, it was assumed that the ability to solve social problems at the verbal level might be an intermediary stage before the child applies the skill to solve his real problems.

One of the encouraging findings was the high degree of consensus between the two judges who scored the test on each of the three criteria of fluency, flexibility, and quality. However, the validity of the instrument as a measure of social skill is questionable. Only small insignificant differences were noticed between the mean scores on the three criteria of the test of sociometrically low, the sociometrically average, and the sociometrically high students.

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between the experimental and the control group, favoring the first, on the Problem-Solving Test after the role-playing intervention. As the findings indicate, no significant differences were found between the experimental and the control groups on either of the three criteria of fluency, flexibility, and quality. This finding does not coincide with the many comments made in the literature about the impact of roleplaying on problem-solving skill (Chesler & Fox, 1966; Klein, 1956; Shaftel

& Shaftel, 1967) nor with some empirical research findings which have demonstrated an increase in problem-solving ability following a role-playing intervention (Hartshorn & Brantley, 1973).

The Changes in the Distribution of the Sociometric Choices--A Discussion of the Post Hoc Analysis

The post hoc analyses of the distribution of the sociometric choices among all pupils within classrooms revealed an interesting trend which was quite marked in the experimental group classrooms as compared to the control group classrooms. This trend included an increase in the percent of highly accepted pupils in the classroom following treatment. As indicated, the increase was noticed in the experimental classrooms in both school districts as opposed to the only slight increase found in the control group classrooms in District B, and a rather marked decrease in the control group classrooms in District A (which might be explained as a regression effect).[28]

The differences between the experimental and the control groups following treatment were quite large (see the adjusted posttest mean scores), and for the data for the combined districts the F ratio, while not significant at the 5% level, reached the 10% level.

The decision to choose those who are accepted by 20% and more of their peers on the net score as a criterion for highly accepted children

---

[28] It is very difficult to find a good explanation of why the experimental classrooms in District A had fewer highly accepted pupils on the pretest than the control classroom.

is, of course, an arbitrary one which, however, does not differ in this respect from criteria which were chosen in other investigations. For example, Jennings (1950) selected the "over chosen" as those who fall more than one S.D. above the group mean. Croft and Grygier (1956) chose six boys in each classroom with the highest preference scores. Northway (1944, 1952) identified these children in the highest quartile as being most popular. Gronlund (1959) selected as "stars" those who were chosen at the upper limit category based on Bronfenbrenner's "fixed frame of reference table" (see Bronfenbrenner, 1945),[29] and Boswell (1953) selected as the accepted group those in the upper 27% of the class. These few examples demonstrate the arbitrary decision researchers made in selecting highly accepted subjects (as well as low status subjects).

It is worth noting that a net score of +20% and more might have two meanings. One is that the child is accepted by at least 20% of his peers and rejected by none. The second, is that a child is rejected by several peers, but accepted by many so that his net score calculated by subtracting the number of rejections from the number of choices yields an excess of positive votes of at least 20%, or one-fifth of the peers.

One interesting finding is the relatively small number of children within a classroom who are highly accepted or "over chosen" by their peers. The figures in this study were four or five children on the

---

[29] It is important to recall, that Bronfenbrenner's "critical row status scores" can only be used in situations where positive criteria or questions were given in the sociometric test.

average. This small number of children with a higher sociometric status is not unusual. Bronfenbrenner (1945), Gronlund (1959), Moreno (1953), and Northway (1952) have already indicated that a common characteristic in sociometric testing is the distortion of the choice distribution, or the tendency of the distribution to be positively skewed. That is, more group members appear at the lower sociometric status positions than at the higher sociometric status positions. Moreno (1953) used the term "sociodynamic effect" to indicate that "The frequency distribution of choices shown in sociometric data is comparable to the frequency distribution of wealth in a society. Extremes are accentuated." In other words, "the exceedingly wealthy are few, the exceedingly poor are many" (p. 640).

Several explanations might be offered for the increase in the number of "over chosen" children in the experimental classrooms from four to five following the treatment. Mouton, Bell, and Blake (1960) found that children with high peer status had greater role-playing skill, and concluded that peer status is related to role taking ability. They reported that the high status children were judged as showing less frustration, acting with more assurance, having less difficulty, and showing greater clarity in expression than were the low status children. They were also seen as manifesting interest and as being more effective in enacting the requirements of the role situation. Bowers and London (1965) found positive correlations between role-playing ability and intelligence. The correlations between their two measures of role-playing ability and WISC (Vocabulary Subtest) were .77 and .88 respectively. Similarly, Florence Moreno (1946) noted that slowness in warming-up

and weakness in role enactment indicate a low spontaneity factor, and appear to accompany a low sociometric position. From these findings one may speculate that the children with a higher peer status rather than those with the lower status had an excellent opportunity to demonstrate to their peers during the roleplaying sessions their roleplaying skills and problem-solving ability.

One may suspect that the low status children were less verbal,[30] demonstrated a lesser ability at role taking, and also had difficulties in being free and open (spontaneous) during the role-play, which actually worked against them by making their social problems more visible to their peers.

It is possible that the teachers tended to call on children who felt more at ease playing in front of their peers (and who supposedly had a greater role-playing skill, a higher intelligence, and also higher peer status) than the low status pupils, some of whom never volunteered to roleplay. If this were true, the low status children might have had very little opportunity to get involved in the roleplaying, while those who did benefited from the program. It should be recalled that the low status students were not identified to the teachers.

One may speculate that the role-playing program would have been more effective for the low status children if (1) the children would have

---

[30] Bonney (1955) used an observation scale and found that the accepted children were much more verbal than the low status children.

been identified for the teachers so that teachers could have involved them more in the program, and (2) if the low students (who seem to have a lower ability or skill for roleplaying) would have been trained separately before the whole class was part of the program. The evidence indicates that roleplaying ability can be improved. Lazier and Sutton-Smith (1970), for example, demonstrated great improvement in dramatic ability (role-playing) after training over a period of two months. Sarbin (1957) showed that educable mentally retarded girls can be stimulated to react intellectually to social situations through the use of psychodramatic and spontaneity training methods.

Some Final Remarks Concerning the Program's Impact

Contrary to what has been hypothesized in this study, the role-playing intervention had only a limited effect on the low status students.

First, it should be remembered that the program only lasted for about 10 weeks and that, on the average, each classroom had only about 14 sessions. This is a very short intervention in light of comments made about the slow impact affective education has in general (Glass & Griffin, 1974). Klein (1956) has pointed out that roleplaying seems to be a long process and that we should not expect miracles from it over short periods of time.

Second, because the low status students were not identified for the teachers, their actual involvement in the program might have been less than desired.

Third, the role-playing program started after the beginning of the second semester in late February. At that time, the reputation a child

has, in both the eyes of his peers and the teacher, is already well crystallized so that only a very dramatic change in the child's behavior might cause changes in the attitudes and perceptions of his peers and the teacher.

Fourth, the large variance found in the data between classrooms might have obscured group differences. The teacher variable might have been an influential factor during testing as well as during the program itself.

Fifth, with all precautions taken, it was quite difficult to conceal from the control teachers what was going on in the experimental classrooms which were located in the same school building. It is possible that some of the control teachers tried several activities directed toward enhancing social growth and socialization even though they did not participate in the workshop and did not have the manual and the materials available. In other words, one may speculate that there was a diffusion effect from experimental to control classrooms.

Sixth, it is possible that, as a result of the program, peers became more sensitive to social problems. Therefore, they were, for the time being, unable to perceive behavioral changes in the low status students, even if they occurred, because of the lowered threshold.

Seven, one may speculate that the intervention program had an impact on all pupils in the class so that everybody changed. However, the relative position a child has was still maintained, so the low status children were still at the bottom of the class. The two major instruments which were used, the sociometric test and the reputation test, were forced-choice instruments which also might have caused this outcome.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to design an intervention strategy, including role-playing techniques and activities, and to train teachers in their use in the classroom in order to improve the social status of socially rejected children. Other objectives were to change teachers' and peers' perceptions of the rejected children as well as to change the self-perceptions of the rejected children themselves. In addition, it was thought that the program might increase the performance of the rejected children on a social problem-solving test.

Now that more school systems are attempting to mainstream mildly handicapped children back into the regular classroom, available evidence indicates they are poorly accepted, which suggests an imperative need to develop procedures and techniques designed to cope with the social problems they might face.

Previous controlled intervention programs with adequate evaluation were tried in experimental settings rather than in the classroom itself. The few controlled intervention programs in the classroom reported in the literature rarely actively involved the classroom teacher or the peers in the classroom, nor did they deal directly with the behaviors and characteristics which seem to contribute to the major causes of low acceptance.

This investigation developed role-playing materials and trained teachers in their use in the classroom to help students develop skills in coping with situations and behaviors previously identified as leading to rejection.

Hypotheses

The main hypotheses of the study stated that following the role-playing intervention, the experimental group rejected children would be higher in their social status relative to the control group as measured by the following three indices: (1) acceptance score, (2) rejection score, and (3) net score.

In addition, it was hypothesized that following the intervention, experimental group rejected children, when compared with controls, would have higher positive and lower negative ratings on (1) the teacher rating scale, (2) their reputation with peers, and (3) self descriptions. Finally, it was hypothesized that following the intervention, the experimental group rejected children would perform higher on the Problem-Solving Test than controls.

Sample

The study was conducted in 65 third through fifth-grade classrooms in two school districts in Indiana. The intact classrooms were randomly assigned to either the experimental or the control conditions.

In each of the classrooms, the four most rejected pupils were identified based on their high negative scores on the sociometric test, and selected as the target population for the investigation.

Experimental Procedures

This study was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, instructional materials for training teachers in roleplaying were developed and piloted in three classrooms during the Fall quarter of 1973.

In the second and major stage, teachers in the experimental group were trained in the use of the materials, and then implemented the roleplaying program twice a week in their classrooms over a 10 week period during the Spring of 1974.

Prior to the program's implementation and at the end of the intervention, all pupils in the experimental and control classrooms completed a sociometric test and a reputation test. In addition, teachers rated all pupils in their classrooms on a Teacher Rating Scale prior to and following the intervention. Finally, following the intervention, a selected group of "target pupils," sociometrically average pupils, and "stars" were administered a problem-solving test.

Results

The major hypotheses were tested utilizing analysis of covariance. No statistically significant differences on adjusted posttest means on the total sample were found between the experimental and the control group on the acceptance score, the rejection score, the net summation score, teacher ratings, or on the reputation test (peer-ratings and self-ratings). No differences between experimental and control groups appeared on the problem-solving test.

However, when the data were examined separately for the two districts certain trends emerged. District B experimental pupils tended to increase

in acceptance. District A control pupils tended to decrease in rejection by peers, and District A experimental pupils described themselves more positively after the intervention.

Other Findings

(1) Statistically significant differences ($P < .01$) were found on the teacher ratings between the low status, the sociometrically average, and the over chosen students on both the socially desirable and the socially undesirable behaviors.

(2) Peers in both groups, experimental and control, perceived the low status children as being "not friendly," "not a leader," "not popular," "not tidy," "unfair in games," and "quarrelsome." These perceptions did not change between pre- and posttests.

(3) A post hoc analysis of the changes which occurred in the distribution of the sociometric choices for the classroom groups as a whole indicated a relatively large, though insignificant difference between treatment groups favoring the experimental classrooms in the percent of highly chosen pupils.

The major findings related to the implementation of the program and to teachers evaluation of the study are as follows:

(1) Teachers used a median of 14 out of 20 planned role-playing sessions over a period of 10 weeks.

(2) Teachers tended to closely follow the sequence of role-playing steps outlined during the workshop and in the manual.

(3) Teachers were found to be quite open in trying different role-playing techniques.

(4) Differences were found between teachers in the two school districts. Teachers in District B, more than in District A, tended to use more of the suggested formats and the last two steps of role-playing.

(5) Teachers' evaluations of the program, which included their judgment of the workshop, the consultation periods, the instructional materials, and the usefulness of the program for themselves as well as the involvement of their students were very positive. However, they did not feel that their students actually made any large gains in learning social skills.

The following major points were stressed in the Discussion Chapter.

(1) There was evidence that the teachers in the program learned many of the role-playing activities and techniques and were ready to implement them in their classrooms.

(2) The role-playing program had only a limited effect on the social status of the rejected subjects, probably because of its short duration. It was also speculated that the low status pupils might have been called on less often by the classroom teachers to actively participate in the programs. In addition, low status students were speculated to have more difficulties in role-playing than the more accepted students.

(3) The large decrease in the rejection score for the control group in District A, as compared to the experimental group, was discussed in light of a possible "John Henry Effect."

(4) The insignificant changes in teachers' judgments or perceptions

and in peer perceptions of the low status pupils were explained on the basis of the implementation of the program late in the school year when attitudes were already crystallized. The speculation was also made that peers did not change their perceptions because they may have become more alert to socially undesirable behaviors during the program. A more plausible explanation was that no changes in perceptions of teachers and peers were found due to the actual small impact of the program.

(5) The changes in the self-perceptions of the experimental group in District A were explained on the basis of the newness of the whole program, and probable changes in teachers' classroom behavior.

(6) The insignificant differences between the experimental and the control group on the Problem-Solving Test was explained on the basis of weaknesses inherent in this test itself. A possible impact of a "John Henry Effect" in District A was speculated.

(7) The increase in the percent of "over chosen" pupils in the experimental classrooms was discussed in light of the higher role-playing skill of more socially accepted pupils.

(8) The more consistent findings in District B as compared to District A were discussed in light of the different educational philosophies between the two districts, and in light of the difference in previous exposure of the districts to affective education.

Conclusions

(1) A role-playing intervention used in the classroom over a short period of time with the purpose of changing the social status of rejected children has only a very limited effect on their acceptance or rejection by peers.

(2) A role-playing intervention, as used in this study, does not have much effect on teacher perceptions of low status students, nor on the peer-perceptions of low status students. This type of program is also ineffective in increasing the performance of pupils on a verbal test of social problem-solving.

(3) A short role-playing intervention in the classroom, as used in the study, may have an effect on the self-perceptions of unpopular children, particularly if they did not participate in similar types of programs in the past. The role-playing program also may have an impact on increasing the number of highly chosen pupils in a classroom.

Limitations of the Study

Although there was considerable effort expended in the development of the instructional materials, in teacher training, and particularly in providing a suitable research design, several limiting factors can be enumerated.

(1) The first limiting factor was the length of time the treatment was provided. A 10-week intervention program of the type used in this study is quite short to be effective.

(2) Because of many practical difficulties, the program started

quite late during the school year (late February) after patterns of peer relationships, perceptions, and attitudes were already crystallized.

(3) Although classrooms in both school districts were randomly assigned to experimental and control conditions, mean differences between the two groups were found on several of the pretest measures. While these differences might have occurred by chance, it is possible that the teachers who administered the tests and who were aware of the experimental condition to which they were assigned had some impact on the scores.

(4) Since earlier research conducted in this area made teachers and, in several cases, peers aware of who the low status students were (which probably had an impact on their ratings and judgments), the decision was made in this investigation not to inform them of which students were selected as the focus of the intervention. However, if the teachers had been informed they might have done more to involve these students in the role-playing sessions. In addition, if the teachers would have known who the unpopular students were and what behaviors were underlying their low social status, they might have selected more appropriate stories and role-playing sessions directed to deal with these specific problems in their classroom.

(5) The use of the "forced choice" Moreno type sociometric test might be seen as a limitation in the study. The fact that pupils were "f rced" to make negative choices of peers within the classroom may have produced high rejection scores for the target population,

while the actual feelings of rejection toward them might have been less following the treatment. The same comment also holds true for the Reputation Test or Guess Who Instrument which also had the element of a "forced choice."

(6) Another possible limiting factor is related to the analysis of the Reputation Test. These analyses were performed on the data for the combined group of boys and girls in the low status group. While several researchers did not differentiate between boys and girls in their analyses of this test, some other researchers looked carefully into the sex variable and reported that peers did differentiate between the "appropriate" patterns or behaviors for the two sexes. In other words, different characteristics were attributed to the popular boys and the popular girls, as well as to the unpopular boys and the unpopular girls. Although this study was not interested in differences related to sex and age, it might have been beneficial to analyze the data separately for the rejected boys and the rejected girls.

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

Based upon the findings of this study the following directions for future activities and research are indicated.

(1) Role-playing activities in the classroom should not be discarded as a method for helping unpopular children gain a better social status. Future research is needed to determine its effect under different conditions. First, the program should be implemented over a much larger period of time than 10 weeks. An entire semester might be an

alternative. Second, it is recommended that the program start much earlier in the academic year. Third, because of the possibility of training children in the role-playing skill or role-taking ability, it would be worthwhile to spend several weeks in training the low status children in dramatic activities or role-playing activities before the whole classroom becomes involved. This might give the low status children a better chance to be more actively and more effectively involved in the program.

(2) Future research needs to focus more of its attention on the full involvement of the classroom teacher. This would particularly include: (a) indicating to them who the unpopular students are and what behaviors seem to be underlying their low social status, and (b) working together with them in finding ways to involve these students more actively in the role-playing sessions. The teacher's full involvement in the program might also have a positive effect in changing their attitudes toward the low status child.

(3) Future research focusing on helping the low status pupils gain a higher social status should use role-playing activities as part of a larger scope of intervention. This would include extended group discussions, games, puppetry, and other affective materials, such as books and films, which might aid the child in gaining insight into his own personal situation and the "world of others."[31]

---

[31] The use of Duso Kit would be an example.

(4) Future research should try to use different instruments to measure the impact of any classroom intervention geared toward changing the low status of unpopular children. For example, Miller's (1956) measuring instrument, "The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale" might be more useful than the Moreno type sociometric test because it is not a "forced choice" test. It would also be worthwhile to measure the impact of the intervention program on other dependent variables such as academic achievement.

(5) If the effect of a role-playing intervention on problem-solving ability is to be investigated, much more work should be put into the development of a test which would be more useful in measuring changes in that ability.

(6) There is a need for a reconceptualization of terms in the sociometric literature. Terms such as isolate and neglectee only have meaning if a sociometric test with positive choices is used. For example, based on Bronfenbrenner's fixed frame of reference, if one sociometric criteria is used with five choices, any subject receiving one choice would be classified as a neglectee, while any subject who receives no choice at all would be classified as an isolate. Had negative criteria been used, both of these subjects might have received many more negative choices than could have been expected by chance and therefore, classified as rejected. Moreno (1953) suggested several forms of isolation such as "simple isolation," "isolated and rejected," and "unchosen and rejected." However, very little clarification of their meaning is found in the literature.

What is needed is empirical work that will help to clarify the terms isolate neglectee in cases when a sociometric test uses both positive and negative criteria. The real criteria would not only be a small number of choices and rejections (which need to be specified), but the psychological and behavioral characteristics that are typical for each group.

(7) There was strong evidence from this study to indicate that in each one of the classrooms studied there were several pupils who were highly rejected by their peers. The problem of peer-rejection is especially critical now that more and more school systems are attempting "mainstreaming," i.e., the integration of mildly handicapped children into the regular classroom. There is a great need for a renewed effort to try a variety of methods and techniques to help the rejected child gain better acceptance. The emphasis should be on long term or continued types of intervention, not only in order to make them more effective, but in order to be able to maintain their long term effects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alden, S. E., Pettigrew, E., & Skiba, E. A. The effects of individual contingent group reinforcement on popularity. Child Development, 1970, 41, 1191-1196.

Amundson, C. L. Increasing interpersonal relationships in high school with the aid of sociometric procedures. Group Psychotherapy, 1954, 6, 183-188.

Atkinson, G. The sociogram as an instrument in social studies, teaching and evaluation. Elementary School Journal, 1949, 50, 74-85.

Austin, M. C. & Thompson, G. G. Children's friendships: A study of the bases on which children select and reject their best friends. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 1948, 39, 101-116.

Axline, V. M. Play therapy. The inner dynamics of childhood. Boston: Houghton Miffin Company, 1947.

Baldwin, W. K. The educable mentally retarded child in the regular grades. Exceptional Children, 1958, 25, 106-108, 112.

Beez, W. V. Influence of biased psychological reports on teacher behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.

Blau, B. & Rafferty, J. Changes in friendship status as a function of reinforcement. Child Development, 1970, 41, 113-121.

Bonney, M. E. Personality traits of socially successful and socially unsuccessful children. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 1943, 34, 449-472.

Bonney, M. E. Social behavior differences between second grade children of high and low sociometric status. Journal of Educational Research, 1955, 48, 481-495.

Bonney, M. E. & Powell, J. Differences in social behavior between sociometrically high and sociometrically low children. Journal of Educational Research, 1953, 46, 481-495.

Bowers, P. & London, P. Developmental correlations of role playing ability. Child Development, 1965, 36, 499-508.

Brophy, J. E. & Good, T. L. Teachers communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.

Brozovich, R. W. Characteristics associated with popularity among different racial and socioeconomic groups of children. Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 63, 441-444.

Bryer, S. J. & Wagner, R. The didactic value of roleplaying for institutionalized retardates. Group Psychotherapy, 1961, 16, 177-181.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The measurement of sociometric status structure and development Sociometry Monographs, No. 6, New York: Bacon House, 1945.

Buchan, L. G. Roleplaying and the educable mentally retarded, Belmont, California: Fearon Publishers, Lee Siegler, Inc. Education Division.

Buscaglia, L. F. Love. Thorofare, N. J.: Charles B. Slack, 1972.

Buswell, M. M. The relationship between the social structure of the classroom and the academic success of the pupils. Journal of Experimental Education, 1953, 22, 37-52.

Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

Cartenson, B. The auxiliary chair technique: A case study. Group Psychotherapy, 1955, 8(1), 50-56.

Chaires, M. C. Improving the social acceptance of educable mentally retarded pupils in special classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1966.

Chesler, M. & Fox, R. Roleplaying methods in the classroom. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1966.

Corsini, R. J. & Cardone, S. Roleplaying and psychotherapy: A manual. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Coutu, W. Roleplaying vs. role taking: An appeal for clarification. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 180-187.

Cox, F. N. Sociometric status and individual adjustment before and after therapy. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 354-356.

Croft, I. J. & Grygier, T. G. Social relationships of truants and juvenile delinquents. Human Relations, 1956, 9, 439-466.

Cunningham, R., Elzi, A., Hall, J. A., Farrell, M., & Roberts, M. Understanding group behavior of boys and girls. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

Dentler, B. A. & Mackler, B. Mental ability and sociometric status among retarded children. Psychological Bulletin, 1962, 59, 273-283.

Dion, K. K. & Berschied, E. Physical attractiveness and peer perception among children. Sociometry, 1974, 37, 1-12.

Dinkmeyer, D. Developing understanding of self and others. Manual, Duso D-1. Minnesota: American Guidance Service, Ind., 1970.

Dinkmeyer, D. Developing understanding of self and others. Manual, Duso D-2. Minnesota: American Guidance Service, Ind., 1973.

Dunningham, M. J. Behavioral differences of sociometric status groups in nursery school. Child Development, 1957, 28, 103-111.

Feffer, M. H. & Gourevitch, V. Cognitive aspects of role-taking in children. Journal of Personality, 1960, 28, 383-396.

Flanders, N. A. & Havumaki, S. The effect of teacher-pupil contacts involving praise on the sociometric choices of students. In Jerome M. Seidman (Ed.), Education for Mental Health, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1963, 410-415.

Flavell, J. H., Botkin, P. T., Fry, C. L., Jr., Wright, J. W., & Jarvis, P. E. The development of role-taking and communication skills in children. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968.

Fleming, L. & Snyder, W. U. Social and personal changes following nondirective group play therapy. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1947, 17, 101-116.

Getzels, J. W. & Jackson, P. W. Creativity and intelligence. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

Glass, R. M. & Griffin, J. B. Response book: Affective education for the in-service elementary and special education teacher. Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1973.

Glasser, W. H. Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Goodman, H., Gottlieb, J., & Harrison, R. H. Social acceptance of EMRs integrated into a nongraded elementary school. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1972, 76, 412-417.

Gottlieb, J. & Budoff, M. Social acceptability of retarded children in nongraded schools differing in architecture. Studies in Learning Potential, Research Institute for Educational Problems, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972, 2, 28.

Gottlieb, J. & Budoff, M. Classroom behavior and social status. Studies in Social Learning Potential. Research Institute for Educational Problems, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973, 3, 53.

Gottlieb, J., Cohen, L., & Goldstein, L. Social contact and personal adjustment as variables relating to attitudes toward EMR children. Studies in Learning Potential, Research Institute for Educational Problems, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973, 3, 51.

Gottlieb, J. & Davis, J. E. Social acceptance of EMRs during overt individual interactions. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1973, 78, 141-144.

Grace, M., Sr. Developing friendliness. Catholic School Journal, 1966, 96-98.

Grambs, J. D. Intergroup education methods and materials, New Jersey, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968.

Gronlund, N. E. Acquaintance span and sociometric status. Sociometry, 1955, 18, 62-68.

Gronlund, N. E. Sociometry in the classroom. New York: Harper, 1959.

Gronlund, N. E. & Anderson, L. Personality characteristics of socially accepted, socially neglected and socially rejected junior high school pupils. Educational Administration and Supervision, 1957, 43, 329-338.

Grossman, B. & Wrighter, J. The relationship between selection rejection and intelligence, social status and personality among sixth grade children. Sociometry, 1948, 11, 346-355.

Guskin, S. L. & Chaires, M. C. Implications of research on peer acceptance. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1966, 1, 185-189.

Hartup, W. W. Peer interaction and social organization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2, 1970, 361-456.

Hartup, W. W., Glazer, J. A., & Charlesworth, R. Peer reinforcement and sociometric status. Child Development, 1967, 38, 1017-1024.

Hartshorn, E. & Brantley, J. C. Effects of dramatic play on classroom problem solving ability. The Journal of Educational Research, 1973, 66, 243-246.

Hartshorne, H., May, M. A., & Maller, J. B. Studies in the nature of character. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929.

Jacobs, J. F. Teacher expectations: Their effect upon peer acceptance. Paper read at the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March, 1970.

Jennings, H. L. Leadership and isolation. New York: Longrams Green and Co., 1950.

Johnson, G. O. A study of social position of mentally handicapped children in the regular grades. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1950, 55, 60-89.

Johnson, G. O. A comparative study of the personal and social adjustment of mentally handicapped children placed in special classes with mentally handicapped children who remain in regular classes. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, 1961.

Johnson, G. O. & Kirk, S. A. Are mentally handicapped children segregated in the regular grades? Exceptional Children, 1950, 17, 65-68, 87-88.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Kinney, E. E. A study of peer group social acceptability at the fifth grade level in a public school. Journal of Educational Research, 1953, 47, 57-64.

Klein, A. F. Roleplaying in leadership training and group problem solving. New York: Associated Press, 1956.

Kranzler, G. D., Mayer, G. R., Dyer, C. O., & Munger, P. F. Counseling with elementary school children: An experimental study. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 966-969.

Kuhlen, R. G. & Lee, B. J. Personality characteristics and social acceptability in adolescence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1943, 34, 321-340.

Lapp, E. R. A study of the social adjustment of slow learning children who are assigned part time to regular classes. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1957, 62, 254-262.

Laughlin, F. The peer status of sixth and seventh grade children, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954.

Lazier, G. N. & Stutton-Smith, B. Assessment of role induction and role involvement in creative drama. Final Report. Columbia University, New York, N. Y., Teachers College Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D. C., Bureau of Research, 1970. Project No. 90032, Grant No. OEG-2-9-420032-1021.

Lehman, D. L. Roleplaying and teacher education; A manual for developing innovative teachers, Washington, D. C., The Commission on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences, 1971.

Lesser, G. S. The relationship between various forms of aggression and popularity among lower class children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 50, 20-25.

Lilly, S. L. Improving social acceptance of low sociometric status, low achieving students. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 341-347.

Lindzey, G. & Byrne, D. Measurement of social choice and interpersonal attractiveness. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1968.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953, 185-186.

Lippitt, R. The auxiliary chair technique. Group Psychotherapy, 1958, 8, 8-23.

Lippitt, R. & Hubbell, A. Roleplaying for personal and guidance workers: Review of the literature with suggestions for application. Group Psychotherapy, 1956, 9, 89-114.

Long, N. J. An exploratory study of the relationship between the growth of the whole child and an attempt to improve the social power of sociometrically rejected elementary school children. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1957.

Lott, B. E. & Lott, A. J. The formation of positive attitudes toward group members. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 297-300.

Maier, N. R. F. Principles of human relations: Applications to management, New York: Wiley, 1952.

McDavid, J. W. & Harari, H. Stereotyping of names and popularity in grade school children. Child Development, 1966, 453-459.

McKinney, J. C. An educational application of a two-dimensional sociometric test. Sociometry, 1948, 11, 356-367.

McLelland, F. M. & Ratliff, J. A. The use of sociometry as an aid in promoting social adjustment in ninth grade classroom. Sociometry, 1950, 55, 60-89.

Mead, G. H. Mind, self and society. C. W. Morris (Ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Miller, R. V. Social status and socioempathic differences among mentally superior, mentally typical, and mentally retarded children. Exceptional Children, 1956, 23, 114-119.

Monroe, J. D. & Howe, C. E. The effects of integration and social class on the acceptance of retarded adolescents. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1971, 6, 20-24.

Moore, S. G. Correlates of peer acceptance in nursery school children. Young Children, 1967, 22, 281-297.

Moreno, F. B. Combining role and sociometric testing--a methodological approach. Sociometry, 1946, 9, 155-161.

Moreno, J. L. Psychodrama, First volume, New York: Beacon House, 1946.

Moreno, J. L. Who shall survive? New York: Beacon House, 1953.

Mouton, J. S., Blake, R. R., & Fruchter, B. The reliability of sociometric measures. Sociometry, 1955a, 18, 7-48.

Mouton, J. S., Blake, R. R., & Fruchter, B. The validity of sociometric measures. Sociometry, 1955b, 18, 181-206.

Mouton, J. S., Bell, R. L., Jr., & Blake, R. R. Role playing skill and sociometric peer status. In J. L. Moreno and associates (Eds.), The Sociometry Reader, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960, 388-397.

Northway, M. L. Outsiders. Sociometry, 1944, 7, 10-25.

Northway, M. L. A primer of sociometry, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1952.

Peckham, P. D., Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. The experimental unit in statistical analysis. The Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 337-349.

Piaget, J. The psychology of intelligence. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.

Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. The psychology of the child. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Proctor, C. H. & Loomis, C. P. Analysis of sociometric data. In M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook (Eds.), Research Methods in Social Relations, Part II, New York: Dryden Press, 1951.

Retish, P. The effect of positive overt teacher verbal reinforcement on peer acceptance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.

Riessman, F. Roleplaying and the lower socioeconomic group. Group Psychotherapy, 1964, 27(1).

Roff, M. Childhood social interactions and young adult bad conduct. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 63, 333-337.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Rucker, C. N., Howe, C. E., & Snider, B. The participation of retarded children in junior high academic and nonacademic regular classes. Exceptional Children, 1969, 35, 617-623.

Rucker, C. N. & Vincenzo, F. M. Maintaining social acceptance gains made by mentally retarded children. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 679-680.

Sarbin, T. R. Spontaneity training of the feebleminded. In C. L. Stacy & M. F. DeMartino (Eds.), Counseling and Psychotherapy with the Mentally Retarded, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Saretsky, G. The OEO P.C. experiment and the John Henry effect. Phi Delta Kappan, May 1972.

Sears, P. S. The effects of classroom conditions on the strength of achievement motive and work output on elementary school children. Cooperative Research Project No. 873, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1963.

Sears, P. S. & Sherman, V. S. In pursuit of self esteem. Belmont, California: Woodsworth Publishing Company, 1964.

Seeman, J., Barry, E., & Ellinwood, C. Process and outcomes of play therapy. The American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 428.

Seeman, J. & Edwards, B. A therapeutic approach to reading difficulties. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 451-453.

Semler, I. J. Relationship among several measures of pupil adjustment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, 60-64.

Shaftel, F. R. & Shaftel, G. Roleplaying for social values. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.

Smith, G. H. Sociometric study of best liked and least liked children. The Elementary School Journal, 1950, 51, 77-85.

Souerwine, A. H. & Conway, K. L. The effects of roleplaying upon the social atmosphere of a small group of six grade children. American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 439.

Spector, S. I. Climate and social acceptability. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1953, 27, 108-114.

Taba, H. Acceptance and rejection. Childhood Education, 1954, 30, 423-426.

Taba, H. & Elkins, D. With focus on human relations. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1950.

Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, D. S., & Semmel, M. I. Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook. Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1974.

Thorndike, R. L. Review of R. Rosenthal and L. Jacobson, "Pygmalion in the classroom." American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5, 708-711.

Torrance, P. E. Guiding creative talent, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Tryon, C. M. Evaluation of adolescent personality by adolescents. Mongraphs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1939, 4(23), Whole No. 4.

Tuddenham, R. D. Studies in reputation III. Correlation of popularity among elementary school children. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 1951, 42, 257-276.

Tuddenham, R. D. Studies in reputation. Psychological Monographs, 1952, 66(1), Whole No. 333.

Wallach, M. A. & Kogan, N. Modes of thinking in young children. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Wiggins, J. S. & Winder, C. L. The peer domination inventory: An empirically derived sociometric measure of adjustment in pre-adolescent boys. Psychological Reports, 1961, 9, 643-677.

Young, L. L. & Cooper, D. H. Some factors associated with popularity. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1944, 35, 513-535.

APPENDIX A

(a) Teachers' Implementation of the Role-Playing Program

(b) Teachers' Evaluation of the Program

Table 21

Mean Percent of Teachers and Mean Percent of Sessions in Which the Role-Playing Steps and Techniques were Implemented in District A, District B, and Combined Districts

STEP OR ACTIVITY	DISTRICT A (N=11)		DISTRICT B (N=20)		COMBINED (N=31	
	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions
Steps:						
1. Warm-ups	(100%)	43.1%	(100%)	52.9%	(100%)	48.0%
2. Presentation of the Problem Story	100%	48.0%	100%	58.3%	100%	53.1%
3. Explanation of the Situation	100%	71.6%	100%	79.0%	100%	75.3%
4. Explaining Participant Roles	100%	61.8%	100%	62.2%	100%	62.0%
5. Explaining Audience Roles:						
a. Audience acted as consultants	100%	30.1%	100%	30.1%	100%	30.1%
b. Audience listened and/or took notes	100%	56.0%	100%	56.8%	100%	56.4%
6. Dramatic Enactment						
a. Pantomime	100%	32.0%	100%	37.5%	100%	34.8%
b. Role Play Story Ending	100%	35.0%	100%	37.7%	100%	36.4%
c. Acting from seat	27.2%	12.8%	25.0%	12.1%	26.1%	12.5%
7. Discussion:						
a. Large group	100%	75.3%	100%	71.4%	100%	73.4%
b. Small group	72.7%	19.1%	95.5%	22.3%	83.9%	20.7%
c. Dyads	18.2%	6.8%	30.0%	8.8%	24.1%	7.8%
8. Re-enactment	45.5%	14.1%	70.0%	21.5%	57.8%	17.8%
9. Summary	54.5%	51.7%	85.0%	57.4%	69.8%	54.6%

Table 21 (cont.)

Mean Percent of Teachers and Mean Percent of Sessions in Which the Role-Playing Steps and Techniques were Implemented in District A, District B, and Combined Districts

STEP OR ACTIVITY	DISTRICT A (N=11)		DISTRICT B (N=20)		COMBINED (N=31)	
	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions	Percent Teachers	Mean % of Sessions
Techniques:						
1. Role Reversal	81.8	18.6	45.0	10.7	63.4	14.7
2. Soliloquy Technique	27.3	12.7	33.3	8.9	30.3	10.8
3. Double Technique	36.3	8.8	25.0	11.3	30.7	10.1
4. The Consultant	72.7	17.2	95.0	23.5	83.9	20.4
5. Multiple Role Players	72.7	24.2	65.0	22.9	68.9	23.6
6. Multiple Enactment	81.8	17.2	85.0	21.2	83.4	19.2
7. The New Role	18.2	6.5	45.0	24.6	31.6	15.6
Alternatives:						
A. Group Discussion						
a. Large group	81.8	23.4	75.0	22.7	78.4	23.1
b. Small group	27.3	6.4	45.0	20.7	36.2	13.6
c. Dyads	9.0	5.2	5.0	9.0	7.0	7.1
B. Auxiliary Chair	9.0	9.0	60.0	10.2	34.5	9.6
C. Writing Ending of Stories	63.3	14.2	80.0	11.6	71.7	12.9

Table 22

Teachers' Evaluation of the Program Percent Giving Each Response to Questions

In District A (N=11), District B (N=20), and Combined Districts (N=31)

A. Usefulness of Program for Teachers

The Workshop	District	I knew most of the techniques before	To a certain degree	Helpful & useful	Very helpful & useful	Extremely helpful & useful	Total
1. Was the workshop useful & helpful.	A	9.0	36.4	18.2	36.4	--	(100.0)
	B	--	15.0	25.0	35.0	25.0	(100.0)
	Both	3.2	22.6	22.6	35.5	16.1	(100.0)
Weekly (Bi-weekly) Consultations	District	Could do without it	Were of little help	Were of some help	Were of great help	Were extremely helpful	Total
2. Were the consultation periods of help to you.	A	9.0	9.0	63.7	18.2	--	(99.9)
	B	--	5.0	50.0	40.0	5.0	(100.0)
	Both	3.2	6.5	54.8	32.3	3.2	(100.1)
General usefulness for teachers	District	Did not benefit	Learned & benefited little	Learned & benefited some	Learned & benefited quite a lot	Learned & benefited a lot	Total
3. How much did you benefit from the program.	A	--	--	44.4	55.6	--	(100.0)[32]
	B	--	--	35.0	50.0	15.0	(100.0)
	Both	--	--	37.9	51.7	10.4	(100.0)
Use of role-playing in the future	District	I don't think that I will use it	May use it from time to time	May use it quite often	May use it a lot		Total
4. Do you think you will use roleplaying in your classroom next year.	A	--	36.4	36.4	27.2		(100.0)
	B	--	35.0	45.0	20.0		(100.0)
	Both		35.0	41.9	22.6		(100.0)

[32] Two teachers pointed out that they thought the program was directed to their students and not to them. N=9 for this group.

Table 22 (Cont.)

B. Manual and Materials

The Manual	District	Of little help	Of some help	Of great help	Extremely helpful		Total
5. Was the manual helpful & useful?	A	--	9.0	36.4	54.6		(100.0)
	B	--	5.0	35.0	60.0		(100.0
	Both	--	6.5	35.5	58.0		(100.0)
The Stories	**District**	**Uninteresting**	**Interesting to a degree**	**Interesting**	**Very Interesting**	**Outstanding**	**Total**
6. How would you rate the stories in the manual?	A	--	--	36.4	54.6	9.0	(100.0)
	B	--	15.0	25.0	50.0	10.0	(100.0)
	Both	--	9.7	29.0	51.6	9.7	(100.0)
Usefulness of the materials	**District**	**Very little**	**Little**	**Some**	**Quite a lot**	**A lot**	**Total**
7. How useful were the other materials (pictures, name tags, etc.)?	A	9.0	9.0	36.4	36.4	9.0	(99.8)
	B	5.0	5.0	35.0	45.0	10.0	(100.0)
	Both	6.5	6.5	35.5	41.9	9.7	(100.1)
C. Impact on The Students' Motivation	**District**	**Very little**	**Little**	**Some**	**Quite a lot**	**A lot**	**Total**
8. How much have they been interested & involved?	A	--	--	9.0	45.5	45.5	(100.0)
	B	--	--	10.0	70.0	20.0	(100.0)
	Both	--	--	9.7	61.3	29.0	(100.0)
Gains from the program	**District**	**Not benefit at all**	**Benefited a little**	**Benefited some**	**Benefited quite a lot**	**Benefited a lot**	**Total**
9. How much did students benefit from program in learning social skills?	A	--	9.0	72.8	18.2	--	(100.0)
	B	--	--	70.0	20.0	10.0	(100.0)
	Both	--	3.2	70.9	19.4	6.5	(100.0)

APPENDIX B

Nonparametric Tests on Acceptance Score, Rejection Score, Net Score, Total Peer-Nomination Scale, and Total Self-Nomination Score for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

Table 23

Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms Which Gained or Did Not Gain in Acceptance from Pre- to Posttesting

District A

Direction / Group	No Gain	Gained	Total
Exp	5	6	11
Cont	5	6	11
Total	10	12	22

X^2_1, 0.18 ($P > .50$)

District B

Direction / Group	No Gain	Gained	Total
Exp	6	14	20
Cont	13	8	21
Total	19	22	41

X^2_1, 3.008 ($.05 < P < .10$)

Combined

Direction / Group	No Gain	Gained	Total
Exp	11	20	31
Cont	18	14	32
Total	29	34	63

X^2_1, 1.96 ($P > .10$)

Table 24

Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms Which Showed a Small or a Large Decrease in Rejection from Pre- to Posttesting

District A

Direction / Group	Small decrease (less than 6%)	Large decrease 6% and more)	Total
Exp	8	3	11
Cont	4	7	11
Total	12	10	22

X^2_1, 1.65 ($P > .10$)

District B

Direction / Group	Small decrease (less than 6%)	Large decrease (6% and more)	Total
Exp	8	12	20
Cont	10	11	21
Total	18	23	41

X^2_1, 0.03 ($P > .80$)

Combined

Direction / Group	Small decrease (less than 6%)	Large decrease (6% and more)	Total
Exp	16	15	31
Cont	14	18	32
Total	30	33	63

X^2_1, 0.13 ($P > .50$)

Table 25

Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms Which Showed a Small or a Large Decrease on Net Score From Pre- to Posttesting

District A

Direction / Group	Small decrease (less than 6%)	Large decrease (6% and more)	Total
Exp	7	4	11
Cont	3	8	11
Total	10	12	22

X^2_1, 1.65 ($P > .10$)

District B

Direction / Group	Small decrease (less than 6%)	Large decrease (6% and more)	Total
Exp	10	10	20
Cont	9	12	21
Total	19	22	41

X^2_1, 0.02 ($P > .80$)

Combined

Direction / Group	Small decrease (less than 6%)	Large decrease (6% and more)	Total
Exp	17	14	31
Cont	12	20	32
Total	29	34	63

X^2_1, 1.27 ($P > .20$)

Table 26

Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms Which Decreased or Increased on Total Score on Reputation Test From Pre- to Posttesting

District A

Direction / Group	Decrease (+)	Increase (-)	Total
Exp	7	4	11
Cont	7	4	11
Total	14	8	22

Fisher Test (NS)[33]

District B

Direction / Group	Decrease (+)	Increase (-)	Total
Exp	10	10	20
Cont	12	9	21
Total	22	19	41

X^2_1, 0.02 ($P > .80$)

Combined

Direction / Group	Decrease (+)	Increase (-)	Total
Exp	17	14	31
Cont	19	13	32
Total	36	27	63

X^2_1, 0.01 ($P > .90$)

[33] For the data for District A (N=22) the X^2 test was used when all expected frequencies (i.e., for each cell) were 5 or more. However, when the smallest expected frequency was less than 5 the Fisher Test was used (after Siegel, 1956, p. 110).

Table 27

Number of Experimental and Control Classrooms Which Increased or Did Not Increase on Total Score on Self-Nomination Scale from Pre- to Posttesting

District A

	Increase (+)	Decrease (-)	Total
Exp	10	1	11
Cont	5	6	11
Total	15	7	22

Fisher Test ($P < .05$)

District B

	Increase (+)	Decrease (-)	Total
Exp	11	9	20
Cont	16	5	21
Total	27	14	41

X^2_1, 1.21 ($P > .20$)

Combined

	Increase (+)	Decrease (-)	Total
Exp	21	10	31
Cont	21	11	32
Total	42	21	63

X^2_1, 0.007 ($P > .90$)

APPENDIX C

Stability of Rejection Score

in District A and District B

Table 28

Stability of Rejection Score

District A

	Number and percent of classrooms which had the same mean rejection or higher on Posttest	Number and percent of classrooms which showed a decrease	Total
Exp.	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	11
Cont	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	11

District B

	Number and percent of classrooms which had the same mean rejection score or higher on Posttest	Number and percent of classrooms which showed a decrease	Total
Exp.	5 (25%)	15 (75%)	20
Cont	7 (33.3%)	14 (66.6%)	21

APPENDIX D

Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables on the Reputation Test and Self-Nomination Scale for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

Table 29

Univariate Analyses of Covariance for Three Clusters of Variables on Reputation Test (Peer Nominations) for District A

Variables	Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Adjusted Post-test Mean	F Ratio	D.F.	Significance
I. Popular	Exp	-26.7	-25.5	-26.0	0.21	4,13	NS
	Cont	-29.2	-27.9	-27.4			
Fair in Games	Exp	-15.7	-13.4	-12.5	1.62	4,13	NS
	Cont	-16.8	-15.6	-16.5			
Full of Fun	Exp	- 8.1	- 5.5	- 5.8	3.51	4,13	.07
	Cont	-12.1	-12.0	-11.7			
Active in Games	Exp	- 8.0	-11.1	-11.0	0.16	4,13	NS
	Cont	-12.8	-12.0	-12.1			
II. Not Talkative	Exp	- 9.4	- 7.0	- 7.5	0.93	4,13	NS
	Cont	-11.7	-12.0	-11.6			
Does not Fight	Exp	- 7.7	- 8.9	- 9.7	0.10	4,13	NS
	Cont	-11.5	-11.5	-10.7			
Not Bashful	Exp	- 0.3	- 2.2	- 2.1	0.0003	4,13	NS
	Cont	- 0.1	- 1.8	- 2.0			
Not a Showoff	Exp	-10.0	- 6.5	- 7.8	0.15	4,13	NS
	Cont	-10.9	- 8.0	- 6.8			
III. Friendly	Exp	-14.6	-15.6	-18.1	0.20	5,11	NS
	Cont	-21.8	-19.2	-16.8			
Leader	Exp	-17.3	-14.5	-15.3	0.26	5,11	NS
	Cont	-19.6	-17.2	-16.4			
Not Quarrelsome	Exp	-10.6	-11.4	-12.7	0.14	5,11	NS
	Cont	-13.3	-12.6	-11.3			
Not Bossy	Exp	- 7.7	- 6.9	- 7.0	0.71	5,11	NS
	Cont	-12.5	- 9.5	- 9.3			
Tidy	Exp	-22.9	-25.8	-27.5	0.58	5,11	NS
	Cont	-27.1	-26.4	-24.7			

Table 30

Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables

on Reputation Test (Peer Nominations) for District B

Variable	Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Adjusted Post-test Mean	F Ratio	Significance
Friendly	Exp	-23.7	-23.2	-21.3	0.02	NS
	Cont	-18.2	-19.01	-20.9		
Not Talkative	Exp	-12.5	-11.4	- 9.9	0.08	NS
	Cont	- 7.4	- 7.7	- 9.1		
Leader	Exp	-16.6	-15.2	-13.9	0.77	NS
	Cont	-16.3	-14.4	-15.7		
Not Quarrelsome	Exp	-19.0	-19.0	-18.5	0.05	NS
	Cont	-15.7	-17.1	-17.6		
Not Bossy	Exp	-14.7	-15.0	-12.7	0.31	NS
	Cont	-11.5	-11.7	-14.1		
Tidy	Exp	-22.3	-22.6	-23.5	2.87	.10
	Cont	-22.7	-19.2	-18.4		
Does not Fight	Exp	-16.4	-20.1	-18.5	1.91	NS
	Cont	-16.1	-12.7	-14.3		
Not Bashful	Exp	- 1.4	1.13	0.37	0.45	NS
	Cont	- 0.3	1.27	2.03		
Popular	Exp	-21.9	-23.1	-23.5	0.25	NS
	Cont	-23.7	-22.1	-21.7		
Not a Showoff	Exp	-14.5	-13.2	-11.5	0.27	NS
	Cont	-11.3	-10.9	-12.6		
Fair in Games	Exp	-17.6	-17.1	-16.0	0.48	NS
	Cont	-14.8	-13.2	-14.3		
Full of Fun	Exp	- 9.9	- 9.2	- 9.2	0.22	NS
	Cont	-10.0	- 8.2	- 8.2		
Active in Games	Exp	-10.3	- 5.8	- 6.6	1.35	NS
	Cont	- 6.1	- 4.9	- 4.1		

D.F. = 1,26

Table 31

Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables

on Reputation Test (Peer Nominations) for Combined Districts

Variable	Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Adjusted Post-test Mean	F Ratio	Significance
Friendly	Exp	-20.4	-20.5	-20.0	0.09	NS
	Cont	-19.4	-19.1	-19.6		
Not Talkative	Exp	-11.4	- 9.8	- 9.0	0.22	NS
	Cont	- 8.9	- 9.2	-10.0		
Leader	Exp	-16.9	-15.0	-14.8	0.32	NS
	Cont	-17.5	-15.4	-15.5		
Not Quarrelsome	Exp	-16.0	-16.3	-16.2	0.08	NS
	Cont	-14.9	-15.5	-15.6		
Not Bossy	Exp	-12.2	-12.1	-11.7	0.06	NS
	Cont	-11.8	-11.0	-11.3		
Tidy	Exp	-22.5	-23.8	-24.4	2.93	0.09
	Cont	-24.2	-21.7	-21.0		
Does not Fight	Exp	-13.3	-16.1	-15.8	2.75	0.10
	Cont	-14.5	-12.3	-12.6		
Not Bashful	Exp	- 1.04	- 0.08	- 0.50	0.55	NS
	Cont	- 0.29	0.18	- 0.50		
Popular	Exp	-23.6	-23.9	-24.3	0.08	NS
	Cont	-25.6	-24.1	-23.7		
Not a Showoff	Exp	-12.9	-10.8	- 9.9	0.45	NS
	Cont	-11.2	- 9.9	-10.8		
Fair in Games	Exp	-16.9	-15.8	-15.5	0.47	NS
	Cont	-15.5	-14.0	-14.3		
Full of Fun	Exp	- 9.3	- 7.9	- 8.1	0.71	NS
	Cont	-10.7	- 9.5	- 9.3		
Active in Games	Exp	- 9.5	- 7.7	- 7.5	0.001	NS
	Cont	- 8.4	- 7.3	- 7.5		

D.F. = 1,48

Table 32

Univariate Analyses of Covariance for Three Clusters of Variables on Self-Nomination Scale for District A

Variables	Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Adjusted Post-test Mean	F Ratio	D.F.	Significance
I. Popular	Exp	-0.25	-0.02	0.04	0.37	4,13	NS
	Cont	-0.09	0.02	-0.04			
Fair in Games	Exp	-.50	0.50	0.51	0.91	4,13	NS
	Cont	-0.35	0.36	0.36			
Full of Fun	Exp	0.18	0.36	0.34	0.02	4,13	NS
	Cont	0.22	0.34	0.36			
Active in Games	Exp	0.34	0.38	0.37	0.41	4,13	NS
	Cont	0.28	0.47	0.49			
II. Not Talkative	Exp	-0.13	0.00	0.01	0.14	4,13	NS
	Cont	-0.10	-0.02	-0.03			
Does not Fight	Exp	0.22	0.31	0.32	2.68	4.13	0.12
	Cont	0.20	0.09	0.08			
Not Bashful	Exp	0.22	0.34	0.32	4.53*	4,13	0.04
	Cont	0.06	-0.02	-0.01			
Not a Showoff	Exp	0.29	0.38	0.39	1.28	4,13	NS
	Cont	0.33	0.27	0.26			
III. Friendly	Exp	0.13	0.22	0.20	0.38	5,11	NS
	Cont	0.21	0.11	0.13			
Leader	Exp	0.11	0.29	0.28	0.01	5,11	NS
	Cont	0.11	0.25	0.26			
Not Quarrelsome	Exp	0.20	0.40	0.41	7.63	5,11	.01
	Cont	0.14	0.06	0.06			
Not Bossy	Exp	0.11	0.43	0.41	0.97	5,11	NS
	Cont	0.18	0.27	0.29			
Tidy	Exp	0.18	0.31	0.35	0.07	5,11	NS
	Cont	0.12	0.43	0.39			

Table 33

Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables

on Self-Nomination Scale for District B

Variable	Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Adjusted Post-test Mean	F Ratio	Significance
Friendly	Exp	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.03	NS
	Cont	-0.01	0.08	0.10		
Not Talkative	Exp	-0.10	-0.21	-0.22	0.39	NS
	Cont	-0.14	-0.16	-0.15		
Leader	Exp	0.15	0.21	0.17	0.17	NS
	Cont	-0.02	0.07	0.10		
Not Quarrelsome	Exp	0.04	0.08	0.06	2.14	NS
	Cont	-0.008	0.15	0.23		
Not Bossy	Exp	0.03	0.21	0.19	0.01	NS
	Cont	0.10	0.15	0.17		
Tidy	Exp	0.16	0.25	0.23	0.67	NS
	Cont	-0.04	0.10	0.12		
Does not Fight	Exp	0.04	0.02	0.01	1.18	NS
	Cont	0.07	0.17	0.18		
Not Bashful	Exp	0.20	0.35	0.32	0.53	NS
	Cont	0.19	0.20	0.22		
Popular	Exp	-0.16	-0.10	-0.20	7.09*	0.01
	Cont	-0.16	-0.02	0.07		
Not a Showoff	Exp	0.07	0.22	0.27	1.65	NS
	Cont	0.09	0.14	0.09		
Fair in Games	Exp	0.28	0.40	0.41	1.22	NS
	Cont	0.10	0.25	0.23		
Full of Fun	Exp	0.27	0.30	0.26	0.25	NS
	Cont	0.09	0.30	0.34		
Active in Games	Exp	0.55	0.46	0.39	0.40	NS
	Cont	0.39	0.41	0.48		

D.F. = 1,26

Table 34

Univariate Analyses of Covariance for 13 Variables

on Self-Nomination Scale for Combined Districts

Variable	Group	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Adjusted Post-test Mean	F Ratio	Significance
Friendly	Exp	0.09	0.14	0.11	0.0003	NS
	Cont	0.06	0.09	0.12		
Not Talkative	Exp	-0.11	-0.13	-0.11	0.06	NS
	Cont	-0.13	-0.11	-0.13		
Leader	Exp	0.13	0.24	0.20	0.07	NS
	Cont	0.02	0.13	0.17		
Not Quarrelsome	Exp	0.10	0.20	0.16	0.0001	NS
	Cont	0.04	0.12	0.16		
Not Bossy	Exp	0.06	0.29	0.28	0.89	NS
	Cont	0.13	0.19	0.20		
Tidy	Exp	0.16	0.27	0.24	0.01	NS
	Cont	0.01	0.21	0.25		
Does not Fight	Exp	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.40	NS
	Cont	0.11	0.14	0.16		
Not Bashful	Exp	0.21	0.34	0.32	4.14	0.06
	Cont	0.15	0.12	0.14		
Popular	Exp	-0.19	-0.07	-0.10	2.89	0.09
	Cont	-0.14	-0.007	0.02		
Not a Showoff	Exp	0.15	0.28	0.29	1.93	NS
	Cont	0.17	0.18	0.17		
Fair in Games	Exp	0.36	0.43	0.62	1.54	NS
	Cont	0.19	0.28	0.30		
Full of Fun	Exp	0.24	0.32	0.27	0.67	NS
	Cont	0.13	0.32	0.36		
Active in Games	Exp	0.47	0.43	0.37	1.76	NS
	Cont	0.36	0.43	0.50		

D.F. = 1,48

APPENDIX E

Analyses of Variance Tables on Teacher Ratings (for Combined Districts) and Problem-Solving Tests for District A, District B, and Combined Districts

Table 35

Analyses of Variance on Teacher Rating Scale for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students for Total Positive and Total Negative Scores (Combined Districts)

Source	df	Positive Characteristics		Negative Characteristics	
		MS	F	MS	F
G(1)	1	6.78		2.69	
L(2)	2	2259.84	78.50*	323.88	18.49*
T(3)	1	16.61		1.15	
S(4) (G)	50	41.92		22.88	
GL	2	4.39	0.15	5.90	0.33
GT	1	.20		3.49	
LT	2	1.49	0.34	2.00	0.93
LS(G)	100	28.78		17.51	
TS(G)	50	4.88		3.03	
GLT	2	.66	0.15	.47	0.21
LTS(G)	100	4.36		2.15	

*P < .01

(1) G = Groups (Experimental vs Control)
(2) L = Level ("Rejected," "Average," "Most Popular")
(3) T = Treatment (Pre-, Post-)
(4) S = Subject (Classrooms)

Table 36

Teacher Ratings (Mean Scores) of "Average" Students and of "Stars" in the Experimental Group (N=26) and Control Group (N=26) on Pre- and Posttests (Combined Districts)

Level	Group	Positive Rating		Negative Rating	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Average	Exp.	27.88	28.65	14.88	15.11
	Cont.	28.15	28.46	15.00	15.65
Stars	Exp.	31.34	32.00	14.30	13.92
	Cont.	32.11	32.76	13.34	13.65

Table 37

Analyses of Variance on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students on Three Criteria for District A

Source	Criteria	Fluency		Flexibility		Quality	
	df	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
G(1)	1	27.18	1.11	2.99	0.31	0.25	0.06
P(2)	2	2.81	0.15	4.57	0.66	2.07	1.26
S(3)	20	24.40		9.50		4.07	
GP	2	12.74	0.68	5.65	0.81	2.51	1.53
PS(G)	40	18.49		6.90		1.64	

(1) G = Group (Experimental vs Control)
(2) P = Position ("Rejected," "Average," "Most Popular")
(3) S = Subjects (Classrooms)

Table 38

Analyses of Variance on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students on Three Criteria for District B

Source	Criteria	Fluency		Flexibility		Quality	
	df	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
G(1)	1	32.82	1.53	6.94	0.54	.0057	0.001
P(2)	2	27.00	1.19	17.70	1.46	5.15	2.26
S(3) (G)	40	21.32		12,65		3.94	
GP	2	99.79	0.43	9.26	0.76	1.74	0.76
PS(G)	80	22.66		12.09		2.28	

(1) G = Group (Experimental vs Control)
(2) P = Position ("Rejected," "Average," "Most Popular")
(3) S = Subjects (Classrooms)

Table 39

Analyses of Variance on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Students on Three Criteria for Combined Districts

Source	Criteria	Fluency		Flexibility		Quality	
	df	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
G(1)	1	2.50	0.10	1.25	0.10	.056	0.01
P(2)	2	16.14	0.77	14.68	1.42	5.66	2.62*
S(3) (G)	62	24.50		11.87		3.86	
GP	2	13.02	0.62	6.70	0.65	1.70	0.82
PS(G)	124	20.96		10.28		2.07	

* $.05 < P < .10$

(1) G = Group (Experimental vs Control)
(2) P = Position ("Rejected," "Average," "Most Popular")
(3) S = Subjects (Classrooms)

Table 40

Mean Scores on Three Criteria on Problem-Solving Test for "Rejected," "Average," and "Most Popular" Children in District A, District B, and Combined Districts

Criteria	District	Group	Unpopular	Average	Most Popular
Fluency	A	Exp. N=11	13.47	14.94	12.75
		Cont N=11	15.02	14.59	15.40
	B	Exp. N=21	12.96	13.05	13.61
		Cont N=21	10.90	12.21	13.45
	Combined	Exp. N=32	13.14	13.70	13.31
		Cont N=32	12.32	13.02	14.12
Flexibility	A	Exp. N=11	10.61	12.33	10.77
		Cont N=11	11.54	11.59	11.86
	B	Exp. N=21	10.75	10.62	11.13
		Cont N=21	10.23	10.44	11.42
	Combined	Exp. N=32	10.70	11.21	11.01
		Cont N=32	10.03	10.83	11.57
Quality	A	Exp. N=11	11.05	12.22	11.44
		Cont N=11	11.30	11.31	11.72
	B	Exp. N=21	11.45	11.35	11.72
		Cont N=21	11.02	11.44	12.09
	Combined	Exp. N=32	11.31	11.64	11.62
		Cont N=32	11.11	11.40	11.96

APPENDIX F

Instruments and Tests

The Social Relations Scale

Name _____ Number _____

School _____ Grade _____

As you know, everybody seems to have some preference about the people he chooses to be with, and those he does not like to be with. On this scale, we would like you to write down which of the children in your classroom, you would choose to work with, to play with, and sit near. Also, we would like you to say which of the children you would probably not choose.

Please give the numbers and the initials of those children you would like to work with, to play with, and to sit near; and the numbers and initials of those you would probably not choose.

Please remember:

(1) Your choices must be from pupils in this room, including those who are absent.

(2) You may choose a pupil for more than one activity if you wish.

(3) Your choices will not be seen by anyone in your class.

1. When you are at recess, who are the children in this classroom you would like to play with?

   (1) _____

   (2) _____

   (3) _____

2. Who are the children you would rather not play with?

   (1) _____

   (2) _____

   (3) _____

3. If you were going to choose children to work with in building or making something, who are the children in this classroom you would like to work with?

   (1) _____

   (2) _____

   (3) _____

4. Who are the children you would rather not work with?

   (1) _____

   (2) _____

   (3) _____

5. If you were asked to choose children to sit next to, who are the children in this classroom you would like to sit next to?

   (1) _____

   (2) _____

   (3) _____

6. Who are the children you would rather not sit next to?

   (1) _____

   (2) _____

   (3) _____

Who Are They?

Name: _____ Number: _____

Date: _____ School: _____

Grade: _____

Below are written lots of things that boys and girls do. Read each description and ask yourself: "Which boys and girls in our class are like this?" Look over the list of names and numbers of the children in the class to find the ones that fit each description. After each description, write the numbers of the three children you feel are most like the person in the description.

You may also write your own number if you think it belongs after a description.

You should remember:

1. You may write the same number after as many descriptions as you want.
2. If you can think only of one child who fits a description, put down only one number.
3. Try to answer all the questions. If you really can't answer a question, go to the next one.
4. Your answers will not be seen by any child in your class.

Now, let's try one together.

Who are the three tallest children in this class?

_____ and _____ and _____.

Look at the list of names and write the numbers of the three children you think are the tallest in the class.

Do you understand what you are to do?

Okay, let's start.

1. Which three children are very friendly and nice to everybody?

_____ and _____ and _____.

2. Which three children do not care much about making friends or being nice to everybody?

_____ and _____ and _____.

3. Which children like to talk very much? They always have something to say.

_____ and _____ and _____.

4. Which three children do not like to talk very much? They are very quiet.

_____ and _____ and _____.

5. Who are the three children who know how to start games and suggest interesting things to do?

_____ and _____ and _____.

6. Who are the three children who don't start games and don't know how to suggest interesting things to do?

_____ and _____ and _____.

7. Which three children quarrel a lot, and get into arguments?

_____ and _____ and _____.

8. Which three children don't quarrel much and like to keep out of arguments?

_____ and _____ and _____.

9. Which three children like to boss others around?

_____ and _____ and _____.

10. Which three children give in to others and are hardly ever bossy?

_____ and _____ and _____.

11. Which three children look the neatest and tidiest?

_____ and _____ and _____.

12. Which three children don't look very neat and tidy?

_____ and _____ and _____.

13. Which three children get into lots of fights?

_____ and _____ and _____.

14. Which three children (almost) never get into fights?

_____ and _____ and _____.

15. Which three children aren't the least bit shy or bashful?

_____ and _____ and _____.

16. Which three children are the shyest and most bashful?

_____ and _____ and _____.

17. Who are the three children that everybody likes?

_____ and _____ and _____.

18. Who are the three children nobody seems to like very much?

_____ and _____ and _____.

19. Which three children like to show off a lot?

_____ and _____ and _____.

20. Which three children hardly ever show off?

_____ and _____ and _____.

21. Who are three children who always play fairly in games?

_____ and _____ and _____.

22. Who are three children who do not play fairly in games?

_____ and _____ and _____.

23. Which three children smile and laugh a lot and are full of fun?

_____ and _____ and _____.

24. Which three children hardly ever smile or laugh?

_____ and _____ and _____.

25. Who are three children who like to play games like football or basketball, or like to run and jump?

_____ and _____ and _____.

26. Who are three children who stay out of games? They don't like to play hard.

_____ and _____ and _____.

Social Behaviors Rating Scale*

by
Yona Leyser

Name of Teacher _____

Date _____

Grade _____

School _____

*Adapted from: Tryon (1939) Tuddenham (1952) Mitchell (1956).

General Directions

On this rating scale you are asked to rate each of the children in your classroom on 14 social characteristics or behaviors (8 are favorable characteristics, and 6 are unfavorable characteristics).
Mark one number next to each child's name. This number represents your rating of the child on the characteristic described.
Please Remember: In Part I, "Ratings on Socially Favorable Characteristics," a rating of 5 indicates the positive end of the scale (child always exhibits that favorable behavior. A rating of 1 indicates the negative end of the scale (the child never exhibits that favorable behavior). In Part II, "Ratings on Socially Unfavorable Characteristics," a rating of 5 indicates the negative end of the scale (the child always exhibits that unfavorable behavior). A rating of 1 indicates the positive end of the scale (the child never exhibits that unfavorable behavior).

PART 1

Ratings on Socially
Favorable Characteristics

Behaviors Rated

1. Popularity
2. Friendliness
3. Leadership
4. Active in Games
5. Helpfulness
6. Fairness
7. Happiness
8. Tidiness

Popularity

5) Child always tends to be highly popular
4) Child usually tends to be highly popular
3) Child sometimes tends to be highly popular
2) Child rarely tends to be highly popular
1) Child never tends to be highly popular

Name (Please Print)
First Last

1.		1.	22.
2.		2.	23.
3.		3.	24.
4.		4.	25.
5.		5.	26.
6.		6.	27.
7.		7.	28.
8.		8.	29.
9.		9.	30.
10.		10.	31.
11.		11.	32.
12.		12.	33.
13.		13.	34.
14.		14.	35.
15.		15.	36.
16.		16.	37.
17.		17.	38.
18.		18.	39.
19.		19.	40.
20.		20.	41.
21.		21.	42.

Part II

Ratings on Socially
Unfavorable Characteristics

Behaviors Rated

1. Bossy
2. Talkative
3. Quarrelsome
4. Show-Off
5. Fighting
6. Shy

Bossy

5) Child is always bossing others around
4) Child is usually bossing others around
3) Child is sometimes bossing others around
2) Child is rarely bossing others around
1) Child is never bossing others around

Name (Please Print) First Last		
1.	1.	22.
2.	2.	23.
3.	3.	24.
4.	4.	25.
5.	5.	26.
6.	6.	27.
7.	7.	28.
8.	8.	29.
9.	9.	30.
10.	10.	31.
11.	11.	32.
12.	12.	33.
13.	13.	34.
14.	14.	35.
15.	15.	36.
16.	16.	37.
17.	17.	38.
18.	18.	39.
19.	19.	40.
20.	20.	41.
21.	21.	42.

Name (Please Print)
First Last

		(Not to be filled in by teacher)		
		Total Positive	Total Negative	Total Positive and Negative
1.	1.			
2.	2.			
3.	3.			
4.	4.			
5.	5.			
6.	6.			
7.	7.			
8.	8.			
9.	9.			
10.	10.			
11.	11.			
12.	12.			
13.	13.			
14.	14.			
15.	15.			
16.	16.			
17.	17.			
18.	18.			
19.	19.			
20.	20.			
21.	21.			

What Would You Do?

Please read and explain the following directions to each of the four children in your class you are to test individually. The names of the children are attached.

"I will read to you about a number of situations in which boys and girls are faced with a problem. In each situation (question) you are to imagine that you are in the place of the boy or girl and you are to tell what you would do if you were in that situation. Try to think hard, and tell all the things you could do in each of the four situations. Do you understand? OK. Let's start."

Be sure the child understands that he is expected to come up with as many answers as he can to each question (situation).

Try to encourage him to come up with several ideas or solutions in each situation by saying, "What else could you do?" or "Try to think hard; I am sure you have more to say." While the child answers a question, write down, in brief, his answers. Move to the next question after you feel the child has no more to say.

Please choose four out of the six problems in the test for each child.

(1) Scott borrowed a book from his friend Jim. When he wanted to return the book he discovered that his younger brother had torn several pages out of the book.

What would you do if you were in Scott's place?

_____

_____

(2) A shy schoolmate has returned to school after a sickness of several weeks. Debby and Bill want to make him feel at home in school again.

What would you do if you were in Debby's or Bill's place?

_____

_____

(3) Tom's job is to keep the lawn mowed around his house. One week because of bad weather, he is unable to mow the lawn until Saturday, and the grass has become quite high. Tom begins his work, which he knows will take him at least three hours. Then, several of his friends come by and ask him to play baseball with them. They tell him that they need him in the game because he is the best pitcher in the neighborhood.

What would you do if you were in Tom's place?

_____

_____

(4) Susie is talking to her friend Carol, about school work when Kathy, another friend of hers, phones to say that she is coming over. Susie knows that the two girls don't like each other.

What would you do if you were in Susie's place?

_____

_____

(5) A watch has been stolen at school.

John finds out by accident that his friend Dick has taken it. He tries to get Dick to return the watch, but is unsuccessful.

What would you do if you were in John's place?

_____

_____

(6) While Ben was working on his math problems, he was hit hard by a paper wad shot at him by another member of the class. Ben stopped his work, and asked himself what he should do.

What would you do if you were in Ben's place?

_____

_____

LESSON ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION

Date _____ School _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____

Story (name) _____

A. Please put a check mark after each step or activity you followed:

1. Warm ups _____
2. Presentation of problem (story pantomime) _____
3. Explaining the situation _____
4. Explaining participants (actors) roles _____
5. Explaining audience roles:
   (a) Audience acted as consultants _____ Listened and or took notes ____
6. The dramatic enactment (role playing):
   (a) Pantomime _____ (b) Role play of story ending _____
   (c) Play in front of class _____ (d) Play from seat _____

Which one or ones of the following techniques did you use during the role playing step:

1) role reversal _____
2) soliloquay technique _____
3) double technique _____
4) the consultant _____
5) multiple role takers _____
6) multiple enactments _____
7) the new role _____

7. Discussion
   (a) Large group (whole class) _____ (b) Small groups _____
   (c) Dyads _____
8. Re-enactment _____
9. Summary _____

B. Alternative Formats

The presentation of the problem story was followed by:

(A) Group discussion (no role enactment) in:
   (a) Large group _____ (b) Small group _____
   (c) Dyads _____

(B) The auxiliary chair technique _____

(C) Written endings to the story _____

C. Evaluation

Please check one number on each scale:

(a) Involvement (emotional) of actors during the dramatic enactment (roleplay, or pantomime)

1	2	3	4	5
very low	low	ok	good	very good

(b) Social relationships between participating actors.

1	2	3	4	5
very poor	poor	average	good	very good

(c) Overall interest of class during the session.

1	2	3	4	5
very poor	poor	average	good	very good

(d) Problem analysis, and solutions class came up with:

1	2	3	4	5
very poor	poor	ok	good (interesting)	very good (very interesting)

EVALUATION FORM

Dear Teacher:

We are very much interested in your evaluation of our study, "Role Playing as a Method for Teaching Social Skills."

Please answer the following questions by marking an X in one of the blanks of the major categories listed in each question. You will also find a place for comments after each section.

There is no need to sign your name. After you have finished, please turn the evaluation sheet into the principal's office.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Yona Leyser

District _____ Class _____

Section A. The Workshop

1. Do you think the workshop at the beginning of the program has been useful and has helped you learn some new techniques and activities to use in your teaching?

a. I knew most of the techniques and activities before ____
b. It was helpful/useful to a certain degree ____
c. It was helpful/useful. ____
d. It was very helpful and useful. ____
e. It was "extremely helpful." ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Section B. The Program and Your Students

1. How much have your students been interested and involved in the program?

a. very little ____
b. little ____
c. some ____
d. quite a lot ____
e. a lot ____

2. Do you think your students benefited from the program in learning social interaction skills?

a. They did not benefit at all. ____
b. They benefited a little. ____
c. They benefited some. ____
d. They benefited quite a lot. ____
e. They benefited a lot. ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Section C. Materials

1. Do you think the manual has been helpful and useful in guiding your roleplaying and discussion activities in the classroom?

a. The manual was of little help. ____
b. The manual was of some help. ____
c. The manual was of great help. ____
d. The manual was extremely helpful. ____

2. How would you rate the stories in the manual?

a. Uninteresting ____
b. Interesting to a degree ____
c. Interesting ____
d. Very interesting ____
e. Outstanding ____

3. How useful and helpful were the other materials (pictures, name tags, briefings)?

a. very little ____
b. little ____
c. some ____
d. quite a lot ____
e. a lot ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Section D. The Weekly (biweekly) Consultations

1. Do you think the weekly or biweekly consultation periods were of help and importance to you?

a. I could do without these periods. ____
b. They were of little help. ____
c. They were of some help. ____
d. They were of great help. ____
e. They were extremely helpful. ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Section E. General Usefulness of the Program for You

1.
a. I don't think I learned and benfited from the program. ____
b. I learned and benefited a little. ____
c. I learned and benefited some. ____
d. I learned and benefited a lot. ____
e. I learned and benefited quite a lot. ____

2. Do you think you will use the techniques/activities and the materials in your classroom next year?

a. I don't think I will use them. ____
b. I may use them from time to time. ____
c. I may use them quite often. ____
d. I may use them a lot. ____

APPENDIX G

Stories Adapted and Their Major Themes

Table 41

Stories Adapted and Type of

Behavior or Characteristic Addressed

Story	Behaviors or Characteristics Addressed
A walk to school	Worried, unhappy and friendliness, dependability, and considerateness
The fight by the water fountain	Physical aggression and friendliness, cooperation and considerateness
The club	Quiet, sad, unhappy and friendliness, cooperation,sharing, and considerateness
Ice skating	Quiet, shy, lonely, and friendliness, cooperation, volunteering, and sharing
Johnny the pitcher	Physical appearance and friendliness, loyalty, responsibility and honesty
The birthday party	Attention seeking, show-off, bossiness and helpfulness, responsibility, considerateness and generosity
Making new friends	Quiet, shy, bashful, physical aggression and friendliness, considerateness and initiative
Names can hurt	Verbal aggression and friendliness, considerateness, generosity and initiative
Billy doesn't do his work	Tattletaler, aggression, and friendliness, considerateness and initiative
The game in the living room	Irresponsibility and honesty, loyalty, friendliness and sharing
You can't catch me	Show-off, attention seeking, bothering and responsibility, friendliness and honesty
Trick or treat	Aggression, attention seeking, dishonesty and responsibility, honesty, loyalty and considerateness
How about another prank?	Aggression, bothering, insensitivity for others and kindness, responsibility, considerateness and helpfulness

Table 41 (Cont.)

Story	Behavior or Characteristics Addressed
The water pistol	Lying, cheating, dishonesty and friendliness, considerateness, responsibility, loyalty and helpfulness
The paper contest	Cheating, dishonesty and cooperation, responsibility, sharing and initiative
The ice cream friend	Social rejection and honesty, responsibility and friendliness
The park street accident	Show-off, attention seeking, and kindness, friendliness, considerateness and responsibility
The little queen	Attention seeking, show-off, bossiness and friendliness, kindness, considerateness and helpfulness
What will you give me?	Physical aggression, and responsibility, sharing, considerateness, and generosity
Mothers day	Helpfulness, considerateness, initiative, sharing, generosity and helpfulness
Why won't you give me a chance?	Quiet, shy and cooperation, considerateness and friendliness
The boy who couldn't wait	Impatience and friendliness, volunteering, helpfulness, generosity and initiative
Honesty questioned	Cheating, aggression and honesty, responsibility, considerateness; and friendliness
The grab bag party	Cheating, unfairness and considerateness, friendliness, sharing, helpfulness, kindness, and initiative
The new teacher	Aggression, bothering, and considerateness, responsibility, initiative, cooperation, and friendliness
How about the money you owe me?	Dishonesty, irresponsibility and considerateness, friendliness and initiative

Table 41 (Cont.)

Story	Behaviors or Characteristics Addressed
The bulletin board	Aggression, bothering, attention seeking and cooperation, dependability, considerateness, and responsibility
Jack the peeker	Cheating, dishonesty and considerateness, helpfulness, friendliness and generosity
The snow fort	Unfriendliness, irresponsibility, dishonesty and kindness, cooperation and sharing
Only two of us	Unfriendliness, unhappiness, and considerateness, cooperation, generosity and initiative
What are we going to do?	Non-cooperation and friendliness, responsibility, generosity and initiative
Fast ball	Physical appearance, unhappiness and loyalty, responsibility, dependability, and friendliness

APPENDIX H

Teacher Training Manual[34]

[34]Only two illustrations of stories are included. These stories were written by the author of the manual. Other stories are copyrighted. (See list of authors and publishers). Also, only a few examples of warm-up exercises were included.

ROLE PLAYING AS A METHOD FOR TEACHING SOCIAL SKILLS

A MANUAL FOR THE ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER

YONA LEYSER

cith CENTER FOR INNOVATION IN TEACHING THE HANDICAPPED
School of Education Indiana University Bloomington

Roleplaying as a Method For Teaching Social Skills

A Manual for the Elementary and Special Education Teacher

(Experimental Edition)

Yona Leyser

Foreword

In school we teachers focus primarily on the cognitive form of learning. However, we all feel that there is more to education than academic study. We are here particularly concerned with the "human relations" and affective problems in teaching. Many teachers seem to feel that they have not been adequately prepared to deal with social and personal adjustment in the classroom. They would like better training in the development and utilization of materials and methods for improving peer relationships in the classroom, and for teaching their students human relationship skills.

If preservice teachers and inservice teachers are given the opportunity to learn and utilize affective or human relations education in their classrooms it is hoped that their students will experience a more balanced curriculum in which both cognitive objectives, and activities, and affective objectives and activities are merged.

Roleplaying activities have been found by many teachers and educational researchers to be useful in solving human relations problems in their classrooms. However, at the same time, it has also been pointed out that not too many teachers have been trained in roleplaying, nor have many had practice in its use.

The intention of this manual is to train inservice teachers and to have them practice several techniques and activities of roleplaying with their students. Those teachers who are interested in learning more about roleplaying as an educational tool will find the recommended list of readings at the end of the introduction useful. The introduction will give an overview of various techniques and activities which can be used in the classroom. Section A includes several warm-up exercises and Section B includes problem stories which end with a dilemma to be solved by the class.

The manual has been used by several teachers. All reported that they and their students had many valuable experiences while trying out the technique.

Y. L.

The author wishes to acknowledge the following sources from which he adapted stories or ideas. The titles indicated in parentheses are the original titles used in the publications cited.

The following stories, adapted from Developing Understanding of Self and Others Manuals (DUSO 1 and DUSO 2) (c) 1970, 1973 by Dr. Don Dinkmeyer, are reprinted with permission of the Publisher, American Guidance Service, Inc.

"The Snow Fort" (The Snow House)
"Jack The Peeker" (Just A Little Peek)
"The Little Queen" (Little King)
"You Can't Catch Me" (The Responsible Person)
"What Will You Give Me" (What Will You Give Me)
"The Boy Who Couldn't Wait" (The Boy Who Couldn't Wait)
"The Club" (The Club)
"The Ice Cream Friend" (Good Humor)
"Making New Friends" (Join The Group)
"Ice Skating" (You Can't Do It)
"Bulletin Board" (Bulletin Board)
"Billy Doesn't Do His Work" (Nobody Cares)
"The Park Street Accident" (The Park Street Accident)
"Why Won't You Give Me A Chance" (The Same Chance)
"Only The Two Of Us" (Two Friends Only)
"The Game In The Living Room" (What's Going To Happen)

The following stories, developed from ideas presented in Roleplaying Methods in the Classroom by Dr. Mark Chesler and Dr. Robert Fox (c) 1966, Science Research Associates, Inc. are reproduced by permission of the Publisher.

"The Fight By The Water Fountain" (Understanding Physical Aggression)
"The Water Pistol" (#120)
"The Grab Bag Party" (The Grab Bag Party)
"The Birthday Party" (The Birthday Party)
"Mother's Day" (Mary's Art Class)
"A Walk To School" (A Walk To School)

The following stories were adapted from Fannie R. Shaftel and George Shaftel, Role-Playing for Social Values: Decision Making in the Social Studies, (c) 1967 reproduced by permission of Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

"Johnny The Pitcher" (Johnny Kotowski)
"Names Can Hurt" (But Names Will Never Hurt Me)
"The Paper Contest" (Paper Drive)
"Honesty Questioned" (A Long Nose Has A Short Life)
"How About Another Prank" (The Menance In The Tree)
"Fast Ball" (Fast Ball)
"What About The Money You Owe Me" (Money For Marty)

The following story was adapted from English Grammer and Composition Vol. 8 by John E. Warringer, John H. Treaner, and Sheila Y. Laws, Copyright (c) 1969 by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. and reprinted by their permission.

"Trick or Treat" (Trick and Treat)

INTRODUCTION

This manual was prepared as a curriculum guide to be used along with workshop and consultation experiences in an inservice setting. In the manual you will find about 32 stories (lessons). Approximately half of the stories are two to five pages long; others are very short. Each story sets the stage for a dramatic situation in which several characters are acting, or interacting, with each other. However, the stories are unfinished; the characters are left in a conflict situation or social dilemma. The pupils, after listening to a story, are asked to roleplay and discuss the ending of the story. Other stories are pantomimed in front of the class. The play is then followed by a discussion.

Each of the lessons was developed to teach children more effective interpersonal and human relationship skills and behaviors. The lessons are intended to facilitate behaviors such as helping, cooperating, caring, sharing, volunteering, and being responsible and friendly. At the same time, they discourage several socially undesirable behaviors such as: fighting, bullying, name-calling, bothering, showing off, bossing, lying, cheating, etc.

Basically, roleplaying, as used here, is a method of instruction in which individuals are asked to step outside their everyday roles and "natural" patterns of behavior and take over the roles and patterns of behavior of other persons. This spontaneous enactment of different roles -- i.e., the creative and imaginative acting out of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors -- and the following group discussion are basic elements in this technique.

It has been pointed out in the literature that through the use of the roleplaying technique, children (and adults) can learn to examine some of

their true feelings, needs, and behaviors and become more aware of interpersonal problems. They can also increase their understanding and sensitivity to the feelings, needs, and behaviors of others and explore possible consequences of alternative ways of acting and behaving. Thus, through these techniques, they can hopefully derive some help in facing interpersonal problems more constructively.

As has been pointed out, the stories have been developed to provide a structured experience, or a learning situation, in which the children can practice several specific interpersonal skills and behaviors. It is hoped that the program will contribute to improved pupil-pupil relationships, and to a more cooperative and constructive classroom atmosphere. However, it should be emphasized that learning and changes are not expected to occur overnight. It will take some practice, probably several weeks or months, until some change in the childrens' behavior will be noticed.

Although much of classroom time is devoted to accomplishing cognitive goals and growth of the students, it has been pointed out by educational psychologists and child psychologists that the social and emotional growth of students should not be considered incidental to their education. This curriculum guide is not meant to compete with the traditional learning objectives and activities, but rather should be viewed as an additional set of activities aimed at the social and emotional growth of students. These activities should not be seen as a "waste of time," as they may very soon pay some dividends.

How to Use Roleplaying Techniques with your Students

We recommend using the roleplay sessions twice a week for approximately 20 minutes each session or lesson. We also recommend, if possible, using

a definite day and time period. This will help to build a sense of continuity. We would like to emphasize that the roleplaying itself or the pantomime are only one part of each session in which several other activities should take place.

As the technique is quite a new one for many of you, as well as for your students, we suggest you start slowly with several warm-up exercises (outlined later). The focus of these exercises is on very simple social situations and simple acts which are familiar to the children and easily performed. Later you will be moving into more complex situations and social problems.

Roleplaying seems to work best when an attempt is made by the director or leader to follow a certain sequence of steps which have been found to be useful. However, you are not expected to follow these steps to the letter. Rather, your modification of some of the steps, your special emphasis on some others, or your adaptations of the steps to your specific classroom situations may be an important contribution to achieving the goals of these lessons. In the following section we outline the steps in some detail so that you can become better acquainted with the technique of roleplaying.

A. Preparation and Instruction

Step 1. Warm-up

Several warm-up exercises are outlined in Section A of the manual. These exercises are "ice breakers" which are intended to help the children to feel more free and comfortable in performing in front of their peers. After the children get more used to roleplaying, and less hesitant in performing, you could skip this step. However, we recommend you start

a lesson or session from time to time with several warm-up exercises. They are fun, and "move" the children into the "right" mood of roleplaying.

Step 2. Selection and presentation of the problem

Thirty-two problem stories have been developed for this manual. The themes in these stories are related to life situations which children experience almost daily, and therefore, provide them with exciting and stimulating situations for dramatization. The particular story or problem selected for a lesson should be based on what you feel to be current problems in your class.

In general, there are two types of problem stories. Longer ones (about two to five pages) and very short ones (approximately one page). You should read the long stories to the children. Or, if you prefer, you could read the story to yourself, and then explain or tell it to your class. Your way of reading or telling is very important in getting the children interested. Therefore, try to do it with an appropriate tone, inflections, and gestures.

The stories are not finished. They stop at a dilemma point, and so set the stage for the dramatization (roleplaying) of several possible endings. The roleplaying is then followed by a group discussion.

The very short stories (pantomime stories) focus more sharply on single issues, but they too are unfinished. Instead of reading them to your students, they will be presented to the class in the form of a pantomime. A group of pupils will "play" the story, i.e., play the different characters and enact their behaviors, while the rest of the children are asked to find out what the story was about. Later the class will discuss possible endings for the story.

Step 3. Explaining the general situation

During this step, the geographic and "climatic" situation is set up. The location for the roleplay or the pantomime is selected as well as props (if you think they are needed). Usually it is advisable to have the actors in a separate area from the "audience." You may make changes, if you like, in the seating arrangements. A basic circle, a modified circle, or sometimes just having the children sitting on the floor may help to generate a feeling of closeness, and facilitate pupil-to-pupil communication.

Step 4. Explaining the participant roles

This step is also called the "briefing" step. It is advisable to give the actors some guidelines before they start to roleplay or pantomime as to what they are expected to do. A sentence such as: "If you were in the shoes of Mark or Susie, what would you say or what would you do?" could help them to get started. For the longer stories, you will find name tags and brief written guidelines for the actors. Those can be given to them instead of explaining to them orally what they are expected to do. These short written descriptions may be very helpful to the actors and they can refer to them during the scene. Do not spend too much time in explaining the roles.

Sometimes it is even advisable to prepare the actors before the lesson starts. This may give them more time to think over their roles. Remind the actors that they are expected to solve the troublesome situations raised by the story.

Step 5. Explaining audience roles

This is the final step of the preparation and instruction stage in which the roles of the audience have to be delineated. Please remember that the active participation of most or all of the children in your class

during these sessions is fundamental to their success.

The audience could be actively involved in a number of ways: (a) You could divide the audience into several groups, each acting as consultants to one of the actors before as well as during the roleplaying. Their continuous support in the form of suggestions as to "how and what to do," will be very helpful to the actors. It is hoped also that the consultants' (helpers') "job" may facilitate their sensitivity to the feeling, thoughts, and actions of the characters in the story. (b) You could ask the audience to remain in their seats and watch the play. During the play ask them to make short notes as to what happened, and how they think the actors solved the dilemmas. Their written notes will later help them during the group discussion. (c) You could divide the audience into small groups, each watching one actor and making written comments about the way he worked out the problem. During the discussion phase, each group could then suggest additional solutions which "their" actors could come out with.

B. Dramatic Action and Discussion

Step 6. The Roleplaying

This is the acting or performance stage. (The pantomime, or the roleplay of a story ending.)

When the children roleplay a story ending, ask them first to act out the last part of the story (which has already been told to them) and only then to move into playing the unfinished part. (The actors are expected to use words, as well as body and facial expressions.)

Children may have a hard time starting the roleplaying (especially early in the program). Therefore, try to direct them. In order to get started, you could ask some guiding questions, give some hints, or even

give a short demonstration. (Don't be worried if things move slowly at the beginning.)

The roleplaying itself may last only for two to five minutes. Remember to indicate to the actors that they are expected to come up with solutions; in particular when you feel that they have lost the direction. After the main points, behaviors, and solutions have been observed, stop the scene and move to the next step.

During the roleplaying step several techniques can be used. It is up to you to decide which one or which ones to use during a particular lesson or session. Following are seven suggestions:

(1) The Role Reversal Technique. A roleplayer or actor can be asked to switch his role and play the oposite role.

(2) The Soliloquy Technique. You can tell an actor that he may stop his action and go over to the audience and tell them how the character he plays feels, what the character thinks, and what he is going to do next.

(3) The Double Technique. An assistant is placed side-by-side with the actor. He is expected to express the feelings, thoughts, and reactions of the character the actor is portraying to the group.

(4) The Consultant. You could ask one or two children to stay side-by-side with the actor and give him advice as to "what to do next."

(5) Multiple Roleplayers. You could ask a group of two to three children (instead of a single child) to take a certain role. The small group plays the role "together."

(6) Multiple Enactments. Ask a group of children to enact the

roles of the characters in the story. At that time several children will wait outside the classroom and prepare their enactment. Later they will be called in and asked to enact the same roles.

(7) The New Role. Sometimes you, or another child , may enter into the act and become a new member of the cast who has not been previously identified in order to help work out some new solution or add some new insight into the situation.

When the dramatic action is finished, indicate to the class that the play is over and have some encouraging words for the actors.

Step 7. Discussion

The discussion step is a very central one in the roleplay technique.

During this phase the children are expected to discuss the feeling, needs, thoughts, and behaviors of the characters in the story, and to speculate on alternative behaviors and solutions to the problems.

It is hoped that the children will learn not only to discuss and suggest solutions on the cognitive level, but also become more sensitive to others' feelings and reactions of humans in general.

The discussion can take several formats, and involve different students or groups of students.

(1) The discussion could take place in a large group; i.e., all the children in the class would be asked to contribute their ideas and solutions to the general discussion.

(2) The discussion could take place in small discussion groups. You could divide the classroom into several smaller groups, each discussing the story and several possible solutions to the problems raised by the story. Later, representatives from

each group will be asked to report to the whole class about their decisions. While the groups are conferring, you could move from group to group and contribute some guiding points.

After a couple of minutes (two to three) the groups will be asked to re-form into a large group to continue the discussion.

During the group discussion phase, try to encourage the children to contribute their ideas, thoughts, and feelings. Also try to respond with empathy and respect to what they have to say.

If you feel that your students have lost the direction, redirect their thoughts and feelings back to the topic.

Step 8. Re-enactment

This step may sometimes be used after the children have suggested several alternative actions during the discussion stage. Re-enactment of the alternatives by new actors or by the actors who played already are two possibilities.

Step 9. Summary of the Session

At the end of each session it is advisable to summarize in short sentences what problems the story has raised and some of the solutions the roleplayers and the class came up with during the discussion. The children could also be asked to indicate what they had learned from the lesson.

The Short Story (Pantomime) Session

When you use the pantomime format, ask for volunteers to present a short show to the class. (You skip steps 1-3.) Explain to the actors (Step 4) what they are expected to do. Read them the short story, or ask them to read it. Don't forget to remind them that they are not supposed to use words, but rather use their eyes,

mouth, hands, and facial expressions. Then move into Step 5--explain to the audience that they are expected to guess what the show was about. The following step is number 6, the pantomime and then Step 7, the group discussion of what the problem was and of possible solutions to the problem raised by the show (story).

Some Alternative Lesson Formats

In a previous section, we suggested a sequence of nine steps which had been found to be successful. However, it is up to you to decide how you are going to proceed. In this section, we will summarize some possible modifications. If you wish, you could use them.

(1) Instead of asking children to enact the roles in front of the class, you could sometimes ask them to take roles or enact the roles from their seats.

(2) Instead of asking children to enact the roles after reading the story to them, you could read the story to them and then divide the class into several small groups, each "identifying" with one character. The groups will be asked to discuss how they would have acted, or how they would have solved the problem had they been that character. Later, representatives from each group will tell about or enact the solutions they worked out in front of other groups.

(3) "The auxiliary chair" format--one or several empty chairs in front of the classroom, could provide a substitute for "live" actors. The chairs represent characters from the story, and the class is asked to describe how the character sitting in a particular chair feels, what he might do, or how he might react to the situation.

(4) Another lesson format could be to ask the class to write possible endings to the story after you read them the problem story (Step 2). Explain to them that they are to come up with some interesting solutions to the problem. Later, children will read their answers to the class. A group discussion (Step 7) will then follow. A modification of this activity would be to ask each child to choose a character from the story and to write what he would have done had he been that particular character. Later, children will read their solutions to the class.

The alternative lesson formats outlined above are only some of the suggested modifications you could use. If you add these to the various roleplay techniques (outlined in Step 6), you may find that you have in your repertoire a sufficient variety of strategies and activities to choose from.

Please Remember:

(1) Roleplaying in the classroom is not psychotherapy. Psychotherapy focuses specifically on the private lives and problems of individual persons, while the roleplaying method in the class is a teaching/learning strategy meant to help all children gain social and interpersonal skills. Therefore, try to avoid the following:

(a) Focusing on the behaviors of individual students;
(b) Engaging in depth probing or digging into personal problems;
(c) Delving into home life, and matters that are out of the domain of peer relationships and school.

In general, make sure that the privacy and security of each individual student in protected.

(2) When you start roleplaying with your students, choose those who are socially competent, and peer leaders (if they don't volunteer), and slowly move toward involvement of the other children.

(3) Don't place a child in a role which represents his usual life role. That means that you should not give the scapegoat in your class the role of a scapegoat; or the aggressive child the role of the fighter, etc.

(4) Don't push children into roles they do not wish. Also a child should feel free to decline a role if he feels uncomfortable in it.

(5) Do not allow physical aggression or violence during the play. Stop the play if you feel it may get too rough. Calm the children down, and then ask them to continue.

(6) Emotional stimulation must be controlled. If the roleplaying situation provokes more emotional excitement than the person can manage, stop the action.

(7) During the roleplays and discussions, try to encourage your students to respond to each other in as noncritical a manner as possible. They may disagree or be critical of the character the child roleplays, but not with the child himself. Also, don't let the students chastise or chide any pupil for a contribution he/or she has made.

Materials

Several materials have been prepared to be used along with this manual. The materials include the following:

(1) Pictures. Nineteen pictures each reviewing the main theme of one of the nineteen stories to be read to the class.

The pictures can be displayed during the session.

(2) Short Story or Pantomime Cards. Each of the thirteen short stories, which children will be asked to pantomime in front of their peers, is printed on a separate card. You could read the short story to the volunteer group of actors, or give them the card so they can read the story for themselves before pantomining it.

(3) Name Tags and Role Descriptions. For each of the thirty-two stories name tags have been prepared. The tags indicate the names of the characters in the story to be portrayed. For some of the short stories (pantomimes), only a few name tags have been prepared. Tags with the position, or title of an actor, would have made it too easy for the children to guess what the story is about.

Supplementary Readings and Materials

For teachers who are especially interested in roleplaying methods, the following readings and/or materials are highly recommended.

(1) Dinkmeyer, D. Developing Understanding of Self and Others. Duso D-1 and Duso D-2. Published by AGS American Guidance Service, Ind. Publishers' Building, Circle Pines, Minnesota 55014, 1970, 1973.

(2) Chesler, M. and Fox, R. Roleplaying Methods in the Classroom. Chicago: Science Research Association, 1966.

(3) Grambs, Jean, D. Intergroup Education, Methods and Materials. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1968.

(4) Shaftel, F. and Shaftel, G. Roleplaying for Social Values. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Section A

Warm-Up Exercises

The exercises outlined in this section are aimed at helping your students to gain some basic experiences with roleplaying.

The acting out of simple roles in front of their peers will help students feel more relaxed, and give them practice and security in public performance and expression.

The exercises included in this section are only examples. Select those which your students seem to like. You could also modify the exercises and create new ones.

How to Get Started?

Just tell your students that they are going to play a game similar to charades. If they don't know the game, explain it shortly.

(1) One-role exercises. Ask single students to perform in pantomime a simple act in front of their peers. Remind the actors that they are expected to use their eyes, mouths, hands, facial expressions, and body movements, but not words. The other children in your class will be asked to guess what is being performed.

You could choose several students and ask them to enact the same roles at the same time, or you could ask each student to enact a different role. Give the students cards with the acts they are expected to perform, or just tell them, but so that no one will hear.

Examples of Exercises

(1) You nail two boards together.
(2) You wash your hands and brush your teeth.
(3) You put on a pullover sweater.

(2) Exercises for Two. Ask two students at a time to perform in pantomime the acts outlined below (or those which you come up with). These exercises already require varying degrees of interaction between actors.

Give the students cards with the roles they are expected to perform, or just take them aside and tell them what they are expected to enact. The other children in the class will be asked to guess what is being performed.

(32) You are two good friends.
(33) You are telling a secret to a friend.
(34) You invite a friend to a party.
(35) You and your friend carry a heavy load.
(36) You and your friend work together.
(37) You listen to a friend telling a story.

Section B

Problem Stories

The New Teacher

The Problem:

Children should take responsibility for what happens in their group. They may not only help somebody in the group stay out of trouble, but also help the whole group. If you know somebody who is going to be in trouble, make him aware of the situation. He usually will be very thankful for it. "When" or "if" to take responsibility for somebody in the group is not an easy decision and serious thought should be given to it before any step is taken.

Introducing the Problem:

Say to the group: "Sometimes, your friend may get into trouble. If he does, he may suffer some painful consequences. Should you tell him about it or make him aware of what may happen? Also, sometimes one child does something and the whole group suffers the consequences. Should you do something to prevent such a child from acting? This story deals with these decisions."

THE NEW TEACHER

On Monday morning after the bell rang, everyone was taking his place waiting for the teacher, Mrs. Davis, to arrive when the door opened and Mr. White, the principal, came in with a young lady. "Good morning, boys and girls," he said, "I have some bad news for you."

"What is it?" asked several children.

"Well," said Mr. White, "Mrs. Davis, your teacher, was taken to the hospital this weekend for surgery. Her husband called this morning

and told me that she is feeling better now, but that she has to stay in the hospital for at least another 10 to 14 days. After that, she has to stay at home for a couple of days until she can come back to work. I guess that we'll have to wait for Mrs. Davis until after the Chrismas vacation. After I got the first call from Mr. Davis, I started to look for a substitute teacher for your class. I was very lucky to find Mrs. Turner, who is a very successful young teacher. By the way, Mrs. Davis can have visitors after Wednesday."

When Mr. White had left the room the new teacher said, "Hello, boys and girls. I am sure you have guessed that I am Mrs. Turner. I will be your teacher for the next couple of weeks. I hope we'll have a good time together. I am very anxious to teach you since I've heard so many good things about your class from the principal."

The first day with Mrs. Turner was a lot of fun and everybody in the class seemed very happy to have her as a replacement while Mrs. Davis was sick. The next day when the fifth graders came into the classroom. Mrs. Turner had a surprise for them. "Boys and girls," she said, "I thought that it would be a good idea to visit the Children's Museum, between Main Street and Garden Street, which just opened last week. There are a lot of interesting things to see and I also heard that there are several exotic animals which were sent from all over the world."

"Hey, great!" said several children.

"Well," Mrs. Turner said, "before we take our trip I have some rules which each of you must follow: first, you have to stay on the sidewalk; second, you must stay in line; third, don't touch flowers and bushes in other people's gardens; fourth, don't kick or start any fights; fifth,

wait for a signal before you cross streets; sixth, don't touch anything in the museum unless you are allowed to do so; and seventh, follow all directions at the museum. That's all. Do you have any questions?"

"No" said the children, thinking to themselves that Mrs. Davis never would have made up so many rules for them.

"Okay, " Mrs. Turner said, "one more thing, please remember that if some of you break the rules during our trip, I will seriously consider the possibility of not taking the class on any more trips."

She then moved into a long, interesting explanation about the importance of the Children's Museum and also about what the class would see. She used several stories, pictures, photographs, and maps. By the time the bell rang everyone was very excited and looking forward to the trip. Only Jerry, a very friendly boy who always seemed to have a good time, was worried a bit. "Hey, guys" he said to Michael, Bob, and Julie, who were excitedly discussing the visit to the museum during recess, "I guess we should take some responsibility for the matter."

"What matter?" asked Bob.

"Well, " said Jerry, "you all heard Mrs. Turner saying that if there is any problem during the visit to the museum, she may not take us for trips anymore."

"Oh boy!" said Julie, "I just remembered that a trip to the State Fair in Indyville is planned to take place two days before Chirstmas vacation."

"That's right," said the others.

"Okay," said Jerry, "you can see the problem now. You know the two boys we have in our class who may cause some trouble, Danny and Bruce. Danny likes to push in line and starts fights whenever he can. Bruce

likes to move around and touch everything he sees. Don't you think we should do something to prevent this?"

"Mmmmm" said Julie,. . . .

Enactment and Discussion:

At first ask Bob, Julie, and Jerry to discuss the situation in front of the class. Michael listens. Later ask Danny and Bruce to tell what they could do.

Roles:

Bob: *You think the group should not take any action. Danny and Bruce are responsible for their own behaviors. It is not your business. What would you tell the group?*

Julie: *You think that the group,or several children in the group, should take action. It is your business. What would you say to the group to convince them? What would you suggest to do?*

Jerry: *You think a good way to help Danny and Bruce is to talk to them. What would you tell them?*

Danny: *What could you do in order to stay out of trouble during the visit to the Museum?*

Bruce: *What could you do in order to stay out of trouble during the visit to the Museum?*

General Discussion:

1. *What is the main problem in the story?*
2. *Why did the problem come up at that particular time?*
3. *What do you think the group can do in order to prevent Danny and Bruce from getting into trouble?*
4. *What could Danny and Bruce do to stay out of trouble?*

What are we going to do?

The Problem:

The story deals with the dilemma a group of boys face when they find out that almost everyone is interested in a different activity. Some boys want to play soccer, some want to play baseball. Some want to go swimming, and one wants to ride his bike.

What could the boys do to solve their problem?

Ask for a group of eight volunteers. Read the story to them, or ask them to read the story. Then ask them to pantomime the story in front of the class. The boys (or girls) are expected to act out the activities they want to pursue.

The rest of the children in the class will be asked to guess what the show was about.

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO?

On Friday afternoon after school was over, the boys in Mr. Smith's class met at the park behind the school.

"Hi, boys," said Billy, "Let's have a good soccer game today."

"That's a good idea," said Bob.

"Wait a minute," said David, "We played soccer last week, why don't we play baseball. I'm tired of soccer."

"I don't like soccer either," said Danny, "Let's play baseball."

"No," said Thomas, "I am going to swim. Who wants to come with me to the swimming pool?"

"Ron and I will," said John, "Look we even brought our swimming suits."

"Look guys," said George, "Why don't we all ride our bikes to the other park on the west side of town? It has a swell road to ride on with long easy

hills to coast down. Its going to be really fun."

"So, guys, what are we going to do today," asked Billy angrily. . .

General Discussion:

1. *Why do you think the boys wanted to do different things?*
2. *Have you been in a similar situation? What was it?*
3. *Let's say Billy is the leader of the group. What would be a wise thing for him to do?*
4. *What would you do, had you been in that situation?*

Roleplaying as a Method for Teaching Social Skills

Yona Leyser

Addendum

The following suggestions can be added to the Introduction Section in the manual.

(1) When you present the activities in the manual to your students, use the term drama rather than roleplaying. Just tell the students that during the next 20 minutes they will be involved in dramatic activities. The term drama seems to be more familiar to them than roleplaying.

(2) When you go into the different activities and formats outlined, remember to start with the simple ones. The warm-up exercises are a good start. However they can also be used later to begin the roleplaying sessions. The next step is to try some short pantomime stories, then, go into different formats of group discussion, and only later into playing endings of stories.

(3) Don't be discouraged when things are slow. It takes time for your class (and you) to get used to the different activities. The solutions which your students come up with may be very simple at the beginning. Encourage them to think about other solutions for the problem or problems raised by a story. A suggested activity would be to ask a group to take a different position on the problem than they had before. For example, tell the group to try and think about reasons why Louise (The Ice Cream Friend) should bring the money to the principal or the police, even if the class didn't think she should do so. You may find that they come up with several interesting reasons.

(4) When you choose characters to enact (roleplay) story endings, you should choose as many players as you wish. There is no need to choose all suggested roles outlined in the manual. Sometimes you might call only two children in front of the classroom, while at another time you would call four or five. Remember that the other children in the class are the audience and should be involved too. (Consultants, evaluators, etc.).

(5) Another discussion format which you could use with your students is called Discussion in Dyads. This discussion in pairs could follow a larger group discussion. For example, have two groups discuss a solution to a problem, each taking a different approach or position. After one-two minutes of group discussion, break the two groups into pairs. Each of the members of a pair represents a different approach. Ask the pairs to discuss the problem for one-two minutes and come up with a possible solution. Then check to find out how many pairs came to a solution and how many did not. Ask for the solutions the dyads came up with.

(6) When you use the format of small group discussion, give your students the opportunity to be with different children each time you have these small group discussions. If a shy child does not speak up in one group, he may do so in another group. Also this may eliminate the possibility that one child will always dominate the group.

APPENDIX I

General Testing Instructions for the Teachers

Dear Teacher,

First, I would like to thank you for your participation in our study. Your help has been greatly appreciated. A separate letter will also be sent to the superintendent and the principal. I hope also that we will find some time to meet with you individually before this school year is over and talk about the findings.

Right now, it is again time for testing. We tested the children in your classroom at mid-year, and we would like to test them at the end of the year.

On this sheet, we will give you some instructions about how to administer the tests. Please read them carefully before you start.

We developed four tests:

(a) The Social Behaviors Rating Scale--Teacher (30 minutes)

(b) The Social Relations Scale--group test (15 minutes)

(c) Who are They?--group test (25-30 minutes)

(d) What Would You Do?--Individual test, four pupils will be tested by teacher (5-10 minutes per pupil)

The tests can be administered over a period of a week and a half. So, no two tests need to be given on the same day.

In addition to the tests, you will be given the list of pupils in your class and their numbers. These lists will be used by the students when they take the group tests. So, be sure to collect the list of names after the first group test you give to the pupils. Also, please check the list before giving it out to make sure that every student's name is on it. Add any missing names and cross out the names of pupils who have left your class.

Specific Directions for each Test

(a) Social Behavior Rating Scale

You filled out this scale at mid-year. Write down the names of the students in your classroom--only once--and then rate all the children on each of the 14 behavioral characteristics. (See instructions on the scale itself.)

(b) The Social Relations Scale

Give each child the list of his peers in the classroom. Make sure he finds his name and number on the list and writes them down on the test form. Read the instructions to the group aloud. Make sure that the pupils understand that they are to write down the numbers and the first names of three children in the room with whom they would like to work, to play, and to sit next to. They should also write down the number and first names of three children whom they would rather not play with, work with, and sit next to. There are six questions in all--No. 1, 3, 5 positive and No. 2, 4, 6 negative. If pupils have difficulties in reading, please read each question to the class and wait until everyone answers before you move to the second question, etc. Make sure that students do not see the answers given by their peers.

(c) Who Are They?

Again, give each child the list of his peers in the classroom. Make sure he finds his name and number and writes them down on the test form. Read the instructions out loud to the group,

and have them do the example together. ("Who are the three tallest children in the class?") Make sure the pupils understand that they are expected to write down, for each of the 26 questions, the numbers of three children who they feel fit each description.

If pupils have difficulties in reading, please read each question to the class and wait until the pupils answer the question before moving to the second one. Make sure that students do not see the answers given by their peers.

(d) What Would You Do?

This is a social problem-solving ability test. Please test four pupils orally and individually in your classroom. We selected the names of the four children, based on the findings from the pretests given at mid-year. It will take about 5-10 minutes to test each child. Please read the instructions carefully. We are interested in getting as many answers (solutions) from the child as he can give for each question.

Missing pupils

Please make sure that all the pupils in your class are tested in all tests. If a child is missing on the testing day, please test him on another day.

What to do with the tests

Please return all the tests to the principal's office. We will be in the school building to pick up the material.

Thank you again,

Yona Leyser,
Research Assistant

APPENDIX J

Scoring Instructions for the

Social Problem-Solving Test

WHAT WOULD YOU DO TEST

A. Definitions

(Number, Flexibility, Quality)

Number (Fluency): Number of different responses (regardless of the quality).

Flexibility: The flexibility score is the number of different principles or approaches used in responding, or the number of different categories used.

Quality response: Are defined as those which show sensitivity to problems and some degree of penetration. By sensitivity it is meant (a) stimulus perception, (b) relevancy of idea, (c) specificity, (d) empathy.

Also: How constructuve is the idea in solving the problems.

The more complex or better elaborated the response is the higher his score will be.

B. Coding Directions

Question 1: Scott borrowed a book from his friend Jim. When he wanted to return the book he discovered that his younger brother had torn several pages out of the book.

What would you do if you were in Scott's place?

Fluency	Flexibility	Quality
1-10	Category: Punish brother Exp.: bit him, spank, etc. Category: Make brother or parents pay Exp.: Scott pay. Mom pay. Category: Hide the fact Exp.: Lie, not tell what happened. Category: Apologize Exp.: Explain what happened. Say I am sorry, etc. Category: Buy new book Category: Compensation (other than buying a book Exp.: Send present, give a book of mine, give money. Category: Tell about Exp.: Tell mother, etc. Category: Some correction Exp.: Give pages, etc. Category: Consequences Not let brother touch books, etc.	1 0 = No solution Socially undesired responses Inappropriate based on the situation Exp.: Hit brother, tell mom pay for some of the pages. Hide fact. Low solution 2 = Brother pay, tape pages, keep books from brother. 3 = Buy a new book or compensate him. 4 = Full answer Take into consideration everything in the situation. Exp.: Apologize about what happened, suggest to buy a book, and explain how he could even make the money.

Question 2: A shy schoolmate has returned to school after a sickness of several weeks. Debby and Bill want to make him feel at home in school again.

What would you do if you were in Debby's or Bill's place?

Fluency	Flexibility	Quality
1-10	Category: Won't care or other negative	1 (0)= No solution, etc. Hit, etc.
	Exp.: Hit out his shyness	
	Category: Help in school work	2 = Share activities or teach
	Category: Play or show things	Play with, eat with, give things
	Category: Buy something or give present	3 = Help to make friends and verbal encouragement
	Category: Help to make friends with others	4 = High sensitivity and empathy
	Category: Invite home	
	Category: Arrange party	
	Category: Verbal encouragement	Exp.: Prepare party, go to movie, assign to leadership position
	Category: Nominate for leadership position	

Question 3: Tom's job is to keep the lawn mowed around his house. One week, because of bad weather, he is unable to mow the lawn until Saturday and the grass has become quite high. Tom begins his work, which he knows will take him at least three hours. Then, several of his friends come by and ask him to play baseball with them. They tell him that they need him in the game because he is the best pitcher in the neighborhood.

What would you do if you were in Tom's place?

Fluency	Flexibility	Quality
1-10	Category: Work on lawn (only) Category: Play (only) Category: Work and play (with or without specification) Category: Find somebody else who will do the job Category: Tell father or mother	1 (0) = Not taking responsibility Exp.: Impulsive answer: I'll go (that it) 2 = Work or play (only) Also: Find somebody consult with parents 3 = Work and play No elaboration or specification 4 = Work and play Specification and elaboration Exp.: Ask friends to help and then we'll play Do half then play then finish

Question 4: Susie is talking to her friend Carol about school work when Kathy, another friend of hers, phones to say that she is coming over. Susie knows that the two girls don't like each other.

What would you do if you were in Susie's place?

Fluency	Flexibility	Quality
1-10	Category: Leave situation Exp.: "Go," not play with either	1 (0) = Leave situation Leave house won't play with either Antagonize situation
	Category: Play only with one	2 = Keep girls apart Play only with one
	Category: Play with both on separate occasions	
	Category: Tell girls and let them decide Explain situation to one of them	Threaten withdrawal friendship 3 = Play with both at separate times or locations Also let girls decide
	Category: Make them friends (with or without specification)	Make them friends (general)
	Category: Threaten withdrawal of friendship	4 = Make them friends With elaboration go together to movie, etc. Explain why it is nicer to be nice, etc.

Question 5: A watch has been stolen at school.

John finds out by accident that his friend Dick has taken it. He tries to get Dick to return the watch, but is unsuccessful.

What would you do if you were in John's place?

Fluency	Flexibility	Quality
1-10	Category: Tattletale To child watch was stolen from	1 (0) = No solution Exp.: Call police, hit Dick, tattletale, have him pay
	Category: Tell about to teacher, parent etc.	2 = Tell somebody to take care Parent, teacher
	Category: Talk to Dick (With or without elaboration)	3 = Talk to Dick (No elaboration) Also: Consequences
	Category: Punish Dick Hit him, take something from him	
	Category: Work a solution which will satisfy Take the watch from Dick and return it without his knowledge	4 = Work out a solution Take watch return it Also: Talk to Dick (with elaboration) Exp.: Try to find out why he did it, or how to help him not to do it anymore, etc.
	Category: Consequences Will not be friend with Dick. Won't trust him, etc.	

Question 6: While Ben was working on his math problems, he was hit hard by a paper wad shot at him by another member of the class. Ben stopped his work and asked himself what he should do.

What would you do if you were in Ben's place?

Fluency	Flexibility		Quality
1-10	Category:	Tell about To teacher, parent, etc.	1 (0) = Attack
	Category:	Try to find out	2 = Find out Same act Tell
	Category:	Same act Throw back	
	Category:	Attack (Verbal or nonverbal) Hit him, call him names, etc.	3 = Talk to child General no elaboration Exp.: Say stop it
	Category:	Talk to the child	4 = No response Won't care. Go to another room, etc.
	Category:	No response (Deliberately) Wouldn't shoot, won't care, go to another room	Also: Talk to child (With elaboration) Try to find out why he did it, etc.

APPENDIX K

Letter of Permission

CENTER FOR INNOVATION IN TEACHING THE HANDICAPPED
School of Education / Indiana University
2853 East Tenth Street / Bloomington, Indiana 47401 / 812—337 5847

To: Dr. Clarence Robbins, Superintendent
Dr. Dan Wertz, Assistant Superintendent

From: Yona Leyser, Research Assistant

Subject: Teachers' use of roleplaying methods and activities in the classroom for teaching social skills.

The proposed program has been developed to study the effects of inservice training of teachers in the use of roleplaying methods on the acceptance of socially rejected children in the classroom. The program will examine the question of whether the application of roleplaying methods in the classroom helps improve social skills within the classroom and whether such methods are an effective educational approach that will:

1. Help unpopular pupils gain a better social position in the classroom.

2. Facilitate behaviors such as helping, cooperating, caring, sharing, volunteering, and being responsible and friendly and discourage several socially undesirable behaviors such as fighting, bullying, name calling, bothering, showing off, bossing, lying and cheating.

3. Produce a more positive classroom atmosphere.

It has been pointed out in the literature, and it is a daily experience of teachers, that social strains and tensions between peers affect the pupils' social and personal growth. It has also been indicated that a positive pattern of classroom relationships and a better understanding between peers are closely related to the classroom learning climate, and hence to the pupils' academic motivation and actual academic outcomes.

Parents, teachers, administrators, and concerned citizens, who, rightly, tend to emphasize the importance of the academic side of learning, should also be aware that programs such as the one proposed here are not in conflict with the academic curriculum. On the contrary, it has already been pointed out that a classroom atmosphere which enhances the social and emotional growth of children is related to better academic achievement.

The specific purposes of this program are as follows:

1. To develop a structured and sequential roleplay curriculum unit which will be implemented by teachers. This unit will be more specific and structured than the more general strategies which have been used in the past. The topics roleplayed and discussed by the

children in each of the sessions revolve around problems related to peer relationships and mutual understanding and acceptance.

2. To train teachers in the use of several roleplaying methods and activities as an educational tool for teaching social skills as well as academics.

3. To sensitize teachers to the nature of the social problems and peer relationships in their classrooms.

4. To measure the effects of the program on student behaviors (peer acceptance) both immediately after the termination of the intervention and several weeks later.

A manual for teacher training in roleplaying has been prepared. This manual includes a presentation of several methods and classroom activities which the teachers could use. The manual also includes 32 problem stories which have been adapted and developed for this program. All of the stories deal with group living or interpersonal relationships. The stories are not finished, therefore, they leave the group in a dilemma. The children are expected to enact the roles of the characters in each story and to discuss possible solutions to the social problems raised by the story.

Approximately 20 to 25 third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade teachers will be asked to participate in a workshop at the beginning of the program. The workshop is expected to last for approximately an hour and a half to two hours. If possible, another workshop for approximately an hour and a half would be used to refine the roleplaying skills. However, if it is impossible for the teacher to attend two workshops, only participation in the first is needed. During the workshops, the teachers will be instructed in the use of several methods and roleplaying activities. Roleplay episodes will also be practiced.

During the intervention period, bi-weekly meetings with each teacher are planned. These meetings will be scheduled at times when teachers are free (recess, lunch hour). The purpose is to get feedback from the teachers about the use of roleplaying and to answer the questions which may come up.

The program is planned to last about eight to ten weeks. Each week the teacher will use the curriculum in two short sessions of approximately 15-20 minutes each.

The impact of the pgrogram on student behaviors and peer acceptance will be measured at the termination of the program and, again, several weeks later. The ability to solve social problems, which is expected to increase after participation in the program, will also be measured. Teacher evaluations will also be used as a measure of the effectiveness of the curriculum.

APPENDIX L

Workshop Outline

CITH Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped

School of Education Indiana University Bloomington

Workshop Outline

Community Schools, Inc.
Tuesday, February 12, Junior High teachers
Wednesday, February 13, Elementary teachers
Approximately 3:15 - 5:00 p.m.

I. Introduction of Program

II. Theoretical background of roleplaying or role taking

III. Outline of steps and demonstration of activities

IV. Alternative activities

V. Discussion and summary

Workshop Leader: Yona Leyser

Workshop Assistants: Anne Briggs

Cynthia Smith

APPENDIX M

Time Table for Testing and Instruments

Table 42

Time Table for Testing and Instruments

(N = 65 Classrooms)

	Pretest February 1974	Intervention March-April 1974	Posttest May 1974
Pupils	1. Sociometric measure 2. Reputation Test	---- ----	1. Sociometric measure 2. Reputation Test 3. Problem-Solving Test (4 selected students in each classroom)
Teachers	1. Social Behaviors Rating Scale (Both groups)	1. Lesson Activities and Evaluation sheet after each session (Exp. Group only)	1. Social Behaviors Rating Scale (Both Groups) 2. Evaluation Form of the Study (Exp. Group only)